



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>

G249

225

V.2

e

HENRY VIII.

AND

THE ENGLISH MONASTERIES.

AN ATTEMPT TO ILLUSTRATE THE HISTORY OF THEIR
SUPPRESSION.

BY

FRANCIS AIDAN GASQUET, D.D.,

MONK OF THE ORDER OF ST. BENEDICT,

SOMETIME PRIOR OF ST. GREGORY'S MONASTERY, DOWNSIDE, BATH.

VOL. II.

Fifth Edition.

JOHN HODGES,
AGAR STREET, CHARING CROSS, LONDON.

1893.

5

Notes :

SOUTH COUNTIES PRESS LIMITED.

1
S
O
U
T
H
C
O
U
N
T
I
E
S
P
R
E
S
L
I
M
I
T
E
D

CONTENTS.

TO THE READER.

CHAPTER I.

THE DISSOLUTION OF THE LESSER MONASTERIES.

State of affairs in the spring of 1536—Obstacles to Henry's return to obedience of Rome—Establishment of Court of Augmentation—Instructions for commencement of dissolution—General method of procedure—Monasteries refounded by Henry—Fines paid for licence to continue—Number of religious expelled on dissolution of lesser monasteries—Petitions for preservation of monasteries—Re-establishment of Bisham by the king—Progress of the work of destruction—Resistance of the Hexham canons. . . . pp. 1-40

CHAPTER II.

THE RISING IN LINCOLNSHIRE

Outbreak of the rising—Causes of popular discontent—The resistance at Louth—People rose in defence of the faith—Feeling against Cromwell and some of the bishops—Statute of uses—Story of the rising—Destruction of the registrar's books in Louth—Murder of the bishop of Lincoln's chancellor—The "articles" of popular discontent—Henry's answer to the demands—Royal anxiety as to the result and the effect of the news in foreign countries—Collapse of the movement—Part taken by the monks. . . . pp. 41-83

CHAPTER III.

THE PILGRIMAGE OF GRACE.

Popular sympathy with the insurgents—Severe measures taken by Henry—Causes of the Yorkshire discontent—Aske's declaration and examinations—Story of the rising—Religious replaced in their houses—Henry's instructions to Norfolk—His "politic device"—Insurgent envoys to the king—Assembly at Pomfret—The settlement at Doncaster. . pp. 84-120

CHAPTER IV.

THE SECOND NORTHERN RISING.

Dispersion of the insurgents—Henry's attitude with regard to the promises made to them—Proclamation of the royal pardon—Instructions to the officials as to the reinstated religious—Aske's endeavour to restrain the people—His belief in the king's honour—The new rising and its failure—Part taken by the religious in the popular movement and especially those of Watton, Jervaulx, Whalley and Bridlington—The *quondam* abbot of Fountains—Trials and executions. . pp. 121-158

CHAPTER V.

DISSOLUTION BY ATTAINDER.

The royal vengeance—Attainder of a religious superior advantageous to the king—Fate of Whalley, Barlings, etc.—Abbot and monks of Furness forced to surrender—Holm Cultram—Lenton priory—Story of the fall of Woburn—Abbot Hobbes—His examinations in the Tower—His views as to papal supremacy—His anguish of mind—His death. pp. 159-202

CHAPTER VI.

THE SUPPRESSION OF CONVENTS.

Hard case of disbanded nuns—Number of convents—Good repute of the English nuns—Some convents purchased a temporary respite from destruction—Many reduced to a state of destitution—Injunctions for Synningthwaite convent in 1534—Con-

Contents.

v

ventual life—The good done by religious ladies—Testimony of royal commissioners—Importance to the king of surrenders and royal instructions on the point—Failure as regards convents—Final suppressions—Number of nuns. . . pp. 203-237

CHAPTER VII.

FALL OF THE FRIARS.

Fundamental principle of the mendicant orders—Numbers in England on suppression—Their troubles—Bishop Ingworth's work in dissolving the friaries—The Dominican prior of Newcastle-on-Tyne—Opposition to the royal policy—Friar Anthony Brown—Progress of the dissolution—Friar Stone—Doctor London and the friars—The surrenders—Small value of the spoils—Sites of the friaries much sought after—Special hardships to which the disbanded friars were exposed.
pp. 238-276

CHAPTER VIII.

PROGRESS OF THE GENERAL SUPPRESSION.

Value of surrenders—Policy of Henry in hiding the scheme of total suppression—Religious anticipate the work of spoliation in some instances—Second suppression of Bisham—Destruction of Lewes—Suppression of Abingdon—Example of Vale Royal—Royal pressure to secure surrender at Hinton Charterhouse and Athelney—Abbots appointed for the purpose of surrendering their houses—Deprivation of the abbot of St. Albans—And forced resignation of abbot of Evesham—Romsey abbey—Dr. Hillyard and the monks—Account of the dissolution of Roche—Total number of ejected religious. . . pp. 277-324

CHAPTER IX.

THE THREE BENEDICTINE ABBOTS.

Pre-eminence of Glastonbury—High position of abbot Whiting—The oath of supremacy—Royal visitation of Glastonbury—Last glimpse of abbot Whiting at Glastonbury—Greater

monasteries not legally dissolved—Whiting removed to London—The abbey dismantled in his absence—Examinations in the Tower—Crumwell's notes—Whiting removed into Somerset "to be executed"—The final scene—Abbot Cook of Reading—His friendship with the king—His attitude to the men of "the new learning"—His adherence to papal supremacy—First troubles—Examinations in the Tower—Abbot Cook's execution at Reading—Abbot Marshall of Colchester—Early troubles—Views of the abbot as to the deaths of More and Fisher—Examination of witnesses against abbot Marshall—His execution. pp. 325-386

CHAPTER X.

THE MONASTIC SPOILS.

Estimate of total value—Amount received by the Crown smaller than usually stated—The general scramble for monastic lands—Work of gathering in the spoils—Private purses made by his agents—Monastic plate—Irreverence shown to relics—Demolition of shrines—Winchester, Canterbury, Durham—Feeling of the people at the work—Total value of the plate—Ecclesiastical vestments taken for the king or sold—Destruction of books and manuscripts—"Defacing" of churches—Lead and bells—Destruction of the buildings, etc. pp. 387-439

CHAPTER XI.

THE SPENDING OF THE SPOILS—THE EJECTED MONKS AND THEIR PENSIONS.

Royal promises not fulfilled—Act of Parliament in 1539 dealing with the great monasteries—How Henry spent the property—Proportion spent on national purposes—Pensions of the ejected monks—Only a portion of the monks pensioned—Voluntary surrender a condition for receiving anything—Amount of pensions—Reasons for granting large sums in a few cases—Deductions from the sum allowed—Many patents for pensions sold—What became of the disbanded religious—

Wills of some Winchester nuns—Restoration of some monasteries in Mary's reign—Last records of disbanded religious.
pp. 440-489

CHAPTER XII.

SOME RESULTS OF THE SUPPRESSION.

Popular prejudice against monastic bodies—A subsequent growth—
The effect of the dissolution on the poor—Associated labour and prayer the fundamental idea of conventual existence—
Caricature drawn by novelists—Various kinds of regulars—
What the great monastic houses did for the poor—How the poor were robbed in their dissolution—Consumption of the sources of charity—Thrift of the old monastic owners—Rack-renting by new lay-owners—Contemporary account of the state of the country—Vagrant laws—Effect of the dissolution on education—Possibility of monasteries taking part in revival of letters—Conclusion. . . . pp. 490-526

APPENDIX.

- I. Monasteries which purchased a temporary existence.
- II. Example of a corrody at Bridlington.
- III. Accounts of the Augmentation Office, etc.
- IV. The Holy Blood of Hayles.
- V. List of English monasteries in the time of Henry VIII.
pp. 529-564

MAPS.

- I. The Black Monks (Benedictines, Cluniacs).
- II. The White Monks (Cistercian).
- III. The Regular Canons, Black (Augustinian), and White (Premonstratensian).
- IV. The Nunneries.

GENERAL INDEX.

TO THE READER.

Although this second volume is larger than the first, it must not be supposed that the limits of "an attempt to illustrate," fixed by the title, have been in any way overpassed. I have steadily resisted the temptation to make use of many incidents which would have added interest to my pages, and which bore more or less upon my subject, but which were not necessary to its illustration. The mass of records ready to hand is all instructive and would furnish material for special monographs on many subjects of deep and present interest not merely to the historian, but to the political inquirer.

My sincere thanks are due for constant and invaluable aid to many friends, amongst whom I trust I may reckon the officials of the Museum and Public Record Office, to whom I had such good reason to express my indebtedness in my first volume. The kindness of one friend has relieved me of the irksome task of making the "Index;" another, Mr. Marsham Adams, has helped me in the concluding chapter; while to Mr. Edmund Bishop, who, from first to last, has aided me by counsel and suggestion as well as by his careful examination of every proof sheet, I owe a debt of gratitude which I gratefully here record. The Maps both in this and Vol. I. are the work of Dom. Conrad Banckaert, of Downside.

*St. Gregory's Monastery, Downside,
8th December, 1888.*

HENRY VIII.
AND
THE ENGLISH MONASTERIES.

CHAPTER I.

THE DISSOLUTION OF THE LESSER MONASTERIES.

BY the spring of the year 1536 Henry had partially succeeded in his designs against the monasteries. The parliament, acting according to his royal will and pleasure, had in March granted him power to deal with the possessions of every religious house, the income of which did not exceed £200 a year. The time was marked by events of importance both to the church and the nation at large. Death had ended the troubles of the unfortunate queen Katherine in January. And the sudden fall and execution of Anne Boleyn four months later seemed to offer a favourable occasion for the reconciliation of Henry with the pope. The king of France had shown the English ambassadors, immediately upon the news of Anne's degradation, that there could not be "a better opportunity of wiping out the stains on

Henry's character, and making himself the most glorious king in the world . . . that everyone should do his duty, and that they would find in the pope that true piety and goodness which ought now to be known to all the world." The ambassador and the bishop of Winchester had with tears in their eyes assured the French monarch "that this was their only desire, and that they would do their part."* The English people, on their side, manifested a general joy at the disgrace and execution of the king's mistress, which was occasioned as well by the possibility of the breach with Rome being now healed, as by their belief that, as Cranmer had declared the marriage of Anne null and void and the consequent illegitimacy of her daughter Elizabeth, the cruel injustice hitherto done to the princess Mary would be redressed.†

The entire freedom of the king at this moment from matrimonial difficulties was looked upon abroad as a ground for hoping that he would now return to the communion of the church from which he had only withdrawn by his determination to maintain at all costs his unlawful union with Anne.‡ Even the pope, if Sir Gregory Casale is to be believed, was only too anxious to smooth the way for Henry's return to obedience, and was merely waiting for

* "Letters and Papers, Foreign and Domestic," arranged and catalogued by James Gairdner, Vol. x., No. 956. This collection will be quoted here as in Vol. i. under the head of "Calendar."

† Calendar, x., pp. 377-429.

‡ Calendar, x., 838, 956, etc.

some slight sign of the king's desire for reconciliation to welcome him back to the bosom of the church. He had spoken, so wrote Sir Gregory to the king himself, in the highest terms of his excellent natural qualities and ability, and of his former love for the faith. He was praying that at this favourable opportunity divine providence might effect this return, and reminded Casale how as cardinal he had used his influence with his predecessor, Clement VII., to further Henry's desires as far as possible. He declared, continued the king's informant, "that in nothing that he had done had he wished to offend your majesty, even though he understood that in England something or other was daily attempted to be done against the Holy See." Indeed, so anxious did the pope appear to effect this reconciliation that Sir Gregory asserts, he gave him many reasons in excuse for having created the venerable bishop Fisher cardinal, "taking God to witness that he hoped to win favour, not animosity" by the elevation of so learned a bishop to the sacred purple.* Allowing for all possible exaggeration on the part of Casale, it is clear that at this time not only was the reconciliation of Henry and Paul III. expected by foreign powers, but that the pontiff himself would have gone as far as he possibly could to meet him.

Unfortunately, however, for the accomplishment of this happy return of England to the unity of the

* Calendar, x., 977.

4 *Henry VIII. and the English Monasteries.*

faith, other matters besides the divorce of Katherine were now destined to keep the king and pope apart. Henry's title to royal supremacy might have been abandoned without much loss of dignity, for although all the terrors of the block and scaffold had enforced the royal pretension to spiritual jurisdiction over the consciences of his subjects, they were still at heart against it, and any alteration of the royal policy in this regard would have been welcomed by all but a small minority of very ardent innovators. A more real obstacle, however, was to be found in the fact, that the king had already seized upon a considerable amount of church property and was at the moment occupied with schemes for further wholesale alienation of the goods of monk, priest and poor. However much, therefore, the past might have been obliterated by a sincere though tardy return to duty and former spoliation condoned by a profession of repentance, such a retrograde step in the royal policy must have infallibly stayed Henry's hand just in the hour when it was prepared to close upon the spoils of monastery and convent, which a subservient parliament had placed within his reach. Reconciliation would obliterate the visions of untold wealth conjured up in the royal imagination by previous plunderings:—dreams which could only be realized by perseverance in the course of destruction upon which he had now embarked.

The French monarch, so wrote the bishop of Faenza to Mons. Ambrogio immediately on the

news of Anne.Boleyn's fall, "thinks it would be easy to bring the king back were it not for his avarice, which is increased by the profit he draws from church goods." * And a year before, the imperial ambassador, Chapuys, had formed the same estimate of Henry's weakness in this respect. "I am informed," he writes, "that letters have come from Gregory de Casale, who says the pope told him that if the king would replace matters of the church as they were, other things could be arranged; but all that is lost labour. So great is the obstinacy and avarice of the king, that he would sooner take back the queen than restore what is due to the church, from which he has taken within the last month 50,000 ducats from 'first fruits.'" † But even here Henry appears to have hesitated for a time and to have checked his course of spoliation. He wrote to the French king, the "kindest and most loving letters," just before he sent Anne to the Tower, saying how willing he was to share the fortune of France. That monarch, on his part, as the bishop of Faenza declared, "was very anxious to have the honour of bringing him back to obedience to the pope, and is trying to do it." In this he was encouraged by certain indications of Henry's desire for a reconciliation, "since the king," writes the bishop, "allows certain doctrines in favour of the church to be preached which he had formerly pro-

* Calendar, x., 956.

† Calendar, viii., 263.

6 *Henry VIII. and the English Monasteries.*

hibited,* desists from suppressing those abbeys which he had ordered to be suppressed, and has sent to seek the archbishop of Canterbury and another who had fled, being friends of the woman (Anne) and the Lutherans; it is thought here that he may be persuaded to the truth."†

These tokens of Henry's inclination to return to a better state of mind soon, however, proved fallacious. It is of course impossible now to say what finally determined him to maintain his attitude of hostility to the Holy See and to pursue his course of reckless spoliation. One event, however, at this time must have had its influence in checking the growth of the better feelings in Henry's heart. From the best of intentions, when not coupled with discretion and when zeal gives full play to angry feelings, the worst consequences often spring. Such must have been the result of the book "*de Unitate Ecclesiastica*," which Pole published at this time and addressed to the king. Henry was the last man to be driven along the right path by whips or coerced into doing his duty by denunciations or strong language. And

* Mr. Gairdner (*Calendar* x., preface xxi.) says that Henry had not "been quite sure for some years past what doctrines he should order to be upheld or denounced from various pulpits, except that the preachers were of course to denounce the authority of the see of Rome. Purgatory had been put in suspense ever since Whitsuntide, 1534, and in February of the present year (1536) the king gave contrary orders against and in favour of certain doctrines within the brief space of four days."

† *Calendar*, x., 922.

Pole's book, however true its facts and cogent its arguments, was couched in language sufficiently vehement, for the time at least, to turn the king from his purpose. Too often, unfortunately, in the world's history has solid good been sacrificed to the vain-glory of style and to the power of penning a caustic sentence and turning with a bitter remark an elegant or striking period, and the work "de Unitate Ecclesiastica" is overflowing with a rhetoric, which would have stung many a milder man than Henry Tudor into rebellion, or turned him from purposes of amendment. "I heard you say once," wrote bishop Latimer to Crumwell, "after you had seen that furious invention of cardinal Pole, that you would make him eat his own heart, which you have now I trow brought to pass, for he must needs now eat his own heart and be as heartless as he is graceless."*

To be told that he, the English king, was worse than the Turk, and to be reminded that, whilst Charles V. was engaged in his glorious expedition to Africa, he, "bearing most untruly the name of defender of the faith, did not merely kill, but tore to pieces all the true defenders of the old religion in a more inhuman fashion than the Turk," was hardly the kind of argument to convince him of the errors of his ways. The unmistakable hints, moreover, which the author throws out as to a probable rebellion of his subjects, were quite

* Mon. iii., 451. The bishop doubtless refers to the recent executions of Pole's relatives.

sufficient to determine the imperious will of Henry to follow in its old course.* Nor was the language of the "instructions" forwarded by the author to England, explaining the purport of the work, calculated to soften the bitter feelings likely to be awakened in the king's heart by the attack. Indeed, in many ways, the letter must undoubtedly have added poison to the wound already inflicted. That it really had this effect on Henry's disposition, though the author's good intentions are undoubted, may be understood by the king's complaint to Pole's mother, the venerable countess of Salisbury, and from the strong disapproval, which she and his relatives in England expressed, at his unguarded and impolitic language. "Item." The record of his mother's examination in the Tower runs:—"She said when she spoke with the king's grace, he showed her how her son had written against him. Alas! (said she) what grief is this to me to see him whom (I bore) set up to be so ungracious and unhappy. And upon this, when her son Montacute came home to her, . . . she said to him: 'What hath the king showed me of my son? Alas! son,' said she, 'what a child have I in him.' And then my lord Montacute counselled her to declare him a traitor to their servants, that they might so report him when they came into their countries. And so she called her servants and declared unto them accordingly to

* Calendar, x., 975.

take her said son for a traitor for now and ever; and that she would never take him other." *

Whatever the cause, the hopes reasonably entertained of reconciliation between England and Rome, or more truly between Henry and Paul, were disappointed. The king's good dispositions vanished and he embarked seriously upon the work of realizing the goods of the lesser monasteries, which parliament by its act had dissolved. Provision had already been made for carrying out the business arrangements necessitated by the transfer of so vast an amount of real property, from the corporations to which it had hitherto belonged, to the crown. Almost the last measure passed through parliament at this time, previous to its dissolution, was the creation of a "Court of Augmentations." This body was established to deal with all lands and moveables coming into the king's possession through the suppression or surrender of the religious houses. It consisted of a chancellor, a treasurer, two legal officers—attorney and solicitor—ten auditors, seventeen particular receivers, a clerk of the court, with an usher and messenger.† The careful organization of this office has been regarded by historians as an indication that, at the time of the dissolution of the lesser monasteries, the king contemplated further and more

* R. O. State Papers, Dom., 1538, Box 388. "Interrogatories ministered to her by my lord Admiral and the bishop of Ely." 13 November, a° 30 Hen. VIII. (1538).

† Rot. Parl. 27 Hen. VIII., 61.

10 *Henry VIII. and the English Monasteries.*

extensive measures in regard to ecclesiastical property than the first act of suppression intended. The officers of the " Court of Augmentations " were to receive and account to the king for all rents, tithes or proceeds of sales ; to examine all leases, to take all surrenders and issue all grants, gifts or releases at their discretion, provided that in all grants " there should be always reserved to the king's highness, his heirs and successors a tenure by knight's service *in capité*, and a yearly rent of the tenth part." One singular reservation is made in the act, by which it is made clear that already Henry had in contemplation the refoundation or preservation of such monasteries as he willed to keep. " Except always are reserved," runs the act, " such and as many of the same monasteries, priories, and houses, with all their hereditaments and possessions, goods and cattles, which the king's majesty by his letters patent and under his great seal shall declare and limit to continue and be in their essential estate and to persevere in the body and corporation as they were before the making of the said act."* The court forthwith commenced its functions. Its officers were appointed on the 24th of April, 1536, Sir Thomas Pope being made treasurer. From the rolls of his accounts and those of his successors in that office we are enabled to form a very fair estimate of the progress of the spoliation, to gather the totals of the sums of money

* R. O. Aug. Office Misc. Bk. 2.

received, and to understand the mysterious manner in which these vast sums appear to have melted away. The chancellor of the court, Richard Rich, received a salary of £750 a year, some £7,500 or £8,000 of our money, and the treasurer, for whose accounts posterity should be grateful, half that sum. If minute receipts are not recorded, almost scrupulous exactness is manifested in the disbursements. The first payments are for the necessary equipment of the office, such as "green cloth called counter-board cloths," scales and weights, large and small iron safes and bags to hold the looked for money, jewels, and plate. The official character of the court is manifested by the purchase of "a book called a 'jury-book' with a silver crucifix fastened upon it," to be used in the court sessions, and of the seals of office, great and small, for which a long price is paid, and to which the sum of 12d. is added for wax bought to show the king the first impressions of these new seals.*

Preparations for extensive dissolutions having been made by the creation of this court, Henry proceeded to carry out his intentions with regard to the lesser monasteries. As the parliament had granted him only such houses as possessed an income of less than £200 a year, it became neces-

* R. O. Exch. Augt. Office, Treas. Roll, 1; m. 10d. For a knowledge of the existence of these "Rolls," as well as for much other information, I am indebted to W. D. Selby, Esq., of the Record Office.

sary to determine which monasteries were unfortunate enough to fall within this pecuniary limit. For this purpose the royal commission was issued to some of the leading men in each county to make a new survey of the houses within the limits of their appointed districts. As early as April 24th, the very day upon which the court of Augmentations was finally organized by the appointment of its officers, instructions were issued for the guidance of these surveyors. They were to form a body of six visitors, comprising an auditor, the particular receiver appointed for the county and a clerk, who were the royal officials and who were to be accompanied by "three other discreet persons to be named by the king in every county." On their arrival at each monastery, they were ordered to summon the superior and show him the "act of dissolution" and their special commission. Next they were to make the officials of the house swear to answer truly the questions they put them. Having done this, they had to proceed on their examination into the state of the establishment and in their report to give the result of their inquiry. They were specially directed to state the number of the religious "and the conversation of their lives;" how many were priests and how many were willing to go to other houses or would take "capacities," and what servants or other dependents were attached to the establishment. Having obtained this information, the royal commissioners were to call for the convent seal and

all muniments of the house, and to make an inventory "by indenture" with the superior, of all plate, jewels and other goods and property, which belonged to the establishment on the 1st March of this year, 1536. They were then to issue their commands to the superior not to receive any rents nor spend any money except for the necessary expenses of the place until the king's final pleasure was known, at the same time enjoining him to continue to watch over the lands, and "sow and till" as before, till such time as the king's farmer should relieve him of this duty. As for the community, the officer was "to send those that will remain in the religion to other houses, with letters to the governors, and those that wish to go to the world to my lord of Canterbury and the lord chancellor for capacities." To the latter "some reasonable reward," according to the distance of the place appointed, was to be given. The superior alone was to have any pension assigned to him, and he was to go to the chancellor of the Augmentations for it.*

These instructions will afford the reader an idea of the methods employed by the king's officers to gather into the treasury of the court of Augmentations the revenues, proceeds of sales and precious plate and jewels from the houses and churches of the lesser monasteries. The system was the same in all cases, and the history of one dissolution is that of all. What the arrival of the six royal commis-

* Calendar, x., 721.

14 *Henry VIII. and the English Monasteries.*

sioners with their retinue of servants at monastery and convent must have been to the inmates can be well imagined. The act of dissolution, it is true, had saved them from the necessity, to which many of their more powerful brethren were constrained, of surrender. Their homes, which pious benefactors had built generations before, and in which for centuries men and women of their order had served God and aided their neighbours, were passing away from them for ever, and the demand for and defacing of their convent seal was the ending of their corporate life. Henceforth they were to pass the remainder of their days as strangers in a larger house or as wanderers in a world, which many had left years before and to which they could never belong. The desecration of their churches, in which they and their forefathers in religion before them had gathered by night and day for the service of God; the seizure for the king's use of their altar plate, in itself often so poor, to them always precious by the association of the past; the rude appraising of their bells and the lead which covered the roofs over their heads; the hurried sales of the mean furniture of their cells, and of the contents of church, cloister and frater, were all so many heartrending evidences of the passing away of all that for which most of the monks and nuns really cared.

The work was of course a process of time, but throughout England it was begun very shortly after the commissions were issued, and by Michaelmas of

the year 1536, or in six months from the passing of the act of dissolution, large sums had been paid into the treasury of the court of Augmentations, and a considerable number of monasteries had been desolated. In many instances the actual process of suppression occupied many weeks. Thus, at Clementhorpe convent, in the city of York, the commissioners first arrived on June 13th, and it was not till August 31st that the final steps were taken, and the nuns turned out of their house. During that period Isabel Ward, the prioress, had been obliged to provide for her household, consisting of nine nuns, an equal number of servants and a lady, Alice Tocotts, who, with her servant, had a corrody in the house. Besides this, here, no doubt, as elsewhere, provision had to be found for the servants of the commissioners who were left to carry out the work. To meet these expenses the prioress was forced to sell a silver chalice and cup, together with some reliquaries.*

In the same way Isabel Savage, the prioress of St. Michael's convent, Stamford, was obliged to sell various pieces of plate to keep up the hospitality of the convent and to support the nuns from May 31, when the dissolution commenced, to July 18, when the work was completed.† And, from numerous examples, which might be cited from the "Ministers'

* R. O. Exch Augt. Off. Mins. Acct. 27-28 Hen. VIII., No. 178, m. 14d.

† *Ibid.*, No. 173, m. 5.

Accounts," it is probable that from six weeks to ten weeks were usually occupied in the work of dissolving these religious houses. To many of the religious thus rendered homeless the hardship must have been more than would readily be believed. Many were of great age, or suffering from disease. Thus, to Elizabeth Johnson, a nun of Arden, a small pittance is allowed for her support, "because she is helpless and deaf and is said to be over 80 years of age."* In the same way to William Coventry, a religious of Wombridge priory, the sum of £6 8s. 4d. is given, upon his being turned out of his home, "because he is sick and decrepid," † but such consideration was apparently only on rare occasions extended to the inmates of the dissolved houses. Of Esholt, a convent in Yorkshire marked out for dissolution at this time, it is said that two nuns, disabled by infirmities, were passed on to their friends. "Dame Elizabeth Pudsey prioress," the entry runs, "aged 70 years, infirm and unable to ride or walk—gone to her friends." Also, "Dame Johanna Hallynrakes, aged 54 years, decrepid; she is not able to be carried for she is lame; (to) continue in her habit and be with her friends." ‡

The returns made by the mixed royal commissions at this time are of great interest and importance. The different estimate these gentlemen formed of

* *Ibid.*, 178, m. 14d.

† *Ibid.*, 165, m. 3.

‡ R. O. Exch. Q.R. Suppress. Papers, 632.

the state of the religious houses in England, to that pictured in the *comperta* of Layton, Legh and their fellow inquisitors, has already been pointed out,* and it is unfortunate that comparatively few of these documents are known to exist.† As an example of the interesting particulars given in these returns, the first in the report of the commissioners for Warwickshire may be here given. The abbey of Pollesworth is stated to be a convent of "Black nuns of St. Benedict's Order." The valuation made at the last visitation of their clear annual income was £87 16s. 3d., and the visitors now assess it at £110 6s. 2d.‡ The nuns are stated to have been fourteen in number, "with an abbess and one 'ancess,' of a very religious sort, one close upon a hundred years old; all desire to 'keep out' their religion there or be transferred to other houses. The number of servants and others attached to the abbey was thirty-eight, namely, three priests, eight yeomen, seventeen hinds, nine women servants, and of "persons having living by promise one very old and impotent creature sometime cook of the house." The lead, bells and buildings were estimated to produce £52 when sold, and the house was declared to be "in good repair." The value of all moveable goods, stocks, stores, and debts owing

* Vol. i., p. 356.

† See Calendar, x., pp. 495-500.

‡ It is curious to find that in almost every instance the new valuation was higher than that returned by the commissioners for the *Valor Ecclesiasticus* the year before.

to the house was calculated at £127 13s. 8d., besides which there were 108 acres planted with trees, "whereof great woods about the age of 100 years" were priced at £114 10s., and a great common with 60 acres of wood.*

In dealing with the lesser religious houses, those which claimed to be cells or dependencies of the greater monasteries, proved a difficulty. This had been foreseen, and the commissioners were instructed in the case of a cell "to deliver a privy seal to the governor, to appear before the chancellor and council of the Augmentations and not meddle with the same cell till the king's pleasure be known."† Accordingly, in Warwickshire, the royal visitors gave privy seals to the prior of Avecourte, Warwick, who alleged his house to be a cell of Great Malvern, and to Charles Bradeway, prior of Alcester, who claimed exemption from the act of dissolution, as a dependent of the abbey of Evesham, ordering them to appear before the court in London within 15 days. Into these cases strict inquiry was made. In the case of Malpas, for example, which claimed to be a cell of Montacute, in Somerset, a commission was ordered to sit at that priory, on November 27, 1536, and to require all deeds and evidences of the claim, and to examine the prior and John Montague, prior of Malpas.‡ As might be expected, these claims

* Calendar, x., 1191 (2). † Calendar, x., 721.

‡ "Monasticon" v., p. 173.

for exemption from the operation of the act of dissolution appear to have failed. In the three cases given above the priors of the cells seem to have returned to their monasteries, where two years later they are found in the list of those pensioned on the final dissolution of the mother houses.*

One curious fact about the dissolution of these smaller monasteries deserves special notice. No sooner had the king obtained possession of them than he commenced to refound some in perpetuity under a new charter. In this way no fewer than fifty-two† religious houses in various parts of England gained a temporary respite from extinction. The cost,

* R. O. Aug. Off. Misc. Bk. 245, ff. 72, 102, 187.

† Canon Dixon says (Vol. i., p. 365): "Three hundred and seventy-six of the smaller monasteries came under the new act, and were dissolved. Out of which thirty-one were refounded for ever in August of this year, and continued a year or two longer." In this he follows Burnet so far as the number is concerned, who states that they were "in all thirty-one houses" thus restored. The names of the fifty-two will be found in the Appendix to this volume. The treasurer of the court of Augmentations acknowledges sums of money received as "fines" from 33 houses, and 19 more, not including Bisham, are enrolled on the Patent Rolls. The dates of the grants will show that they were not all refounded in August. Stevens has, moreover ("Monasticon" ii., Appendix 17-19), published an original document containing the names of the lesser monasteries which escaped immediate destruction, specifying the individuals to whom the king had previously granted, and distinguishing those houses which had been actually refounded when the paper was drawn up. From this it appears that the whole number respited was 123. Forty-six had already been refounded, five were still doubtful; and of these 51 no less than 33 had been previously promised to different private persons.

However, was considerable to themselves, and likewise to their friends, as they were finally suppressed before they were able to repay the sums borrowed to purchase this favour of their royal founder. In hard cash the treasurer of the court of Augmentations acknowledges having received "in part payment of the various sums of money due to the king for fines or compositions, for the toleration and continuance" of thirty-three of these monasteries some £5,948 6s. 8d., or about £60,000 of our money. The same Sir Thomas Pope ingenuously adds, that he has not counted the arrears due to the office under this head, "since all and each of the said monasteries before the close of the account have by surrender come into the king's hands, or by the authority of parliament have been added to the augmentation of the royal revenue. For this reason therefore the king has remitted all sums of money still due to him as the residue of their fines for his royal toleration."*

The sums paid by the re-established houses vary from £400, given by the two houses of Polleshoe, in Devon, and Albaland, in the diocese of St. David's, to the £20 furnished by the Carthusians of St. Anne's, Coventry, the two first paying nearly three times their annual revenue as a fine to the king for a grant under the great seal, enrolled on the Patent roll, of establish-

* R. O. Augt. Off. Treasur. Rolls I., mm. 4d. 5.

ment "in perpetuity."* Besides these pecuniary payments, Henry had in some cases helped himself well to the monastic manors, and having lessened the income of houses already suffering from poverty, allowed them to be re-established for a perpetuity commensurate with his royal whims. Thus the convent of St. Mary's, Winchester, which according to the *Valor* possessed a clear income of £179 7s. 2d., not only paid a fine of £333 6s. 8d., but was re-established with the loss of some of its richest possessions.

It is well to note that several of the monasteries and convents thus re-established were among the number of those gravely defamed by Layton and Legh in their *comperta*, and in more than one case a superior incriminated by them was reappointed in the new foundation. Besides the sums paid to the king by the religious for the privilege of continuance, there is hardly any doubt that in days when influence was to be purchased, other bribes were exacted from the houses so refounded by Henry's hungry officials.† One example of the straits to which these exactions reduced many of the religious houses may be given. The convent of nuns at Stixwold, in Lincolnshire,

* See "Rot. Pat.," 28 Hen. VIII., pars i., ii., iv., v., and 29 Hen. VIII., i., ii., iv., v.

† Burnet says, "It is not unlikely that some presents to the commissioners, or to Crumwell, made these houses outlive this ruin: for I find great trading in bribes at this time, which is not to be wondered at, when there was so much to be shared."

wrote to Heneage, the king's visitor, to beg his good offices in their regard. "Right worshipful sir," they say, "as your poor and daily beads-women, we humbly commend us unto you, advertising you that by the goodness of my lord privy seal and by his only means and suit to the king's majesty, our house doth stand, paying to his highness nine hundred marks fine* besides our first-fruits, which is £150, and also a pension of £34 by the year for ever. Good Mr. Heneage, we most humbly pray and desire you, in the way of charity and for God's sake, to be mean to my lord privy seal that he will of his goodness be suitor to the king's majesty for to remit and forgive the said pension of £34 a year, or else we shall never be able to live and pay the king the aforesaid money.

"We be eighteen nuns and a sister in our house besides officers and servants to the number of 50 persons in all, and our stock and cattle being delivered up this year past; which was our chief hope and living. And if by my lord privy seal's goodness and yours we may obtain redemption of the said yearly pension we shall take pains to live poorly and serve God and pray daily for the king's majesty, my lord privy seal, and you during our lives. And if at your contemplation we cannot obtain grace of the said pension we shall upon necessity, for that we shall not be able to pay and perform all such

* The treasurer of the augmentation office only acknowledged having received £21 13s. 4d.

payments as we be bound, give up the house into the king's highness' hand : which were great pity, if it pleased God and the king otherwise.

“ From Stixwold the 8th day of January

“ By your poor bedes-women

“ The whole convent of Stixwold.”*

It is difficult to estimate correctly the number of houses which passed into the king's power by the operation of this act of dissolution. Various numbers have been stated, but the authority of Stowe is usually relied upon, that “ the number of these houses then suppressed were 376, the value of their lands then £32,000 and more by year.” As these suppressions were not all carried out at the same time, but occupied the royal commissioners many months, the number can only refer to all the houses of religion with an income of £200 or under. This number is fairly correct. In the contemporary “ list of monasteries in England of a less yearly value than £200 ” the number stated is 362,† but in this are included “ cells ” belonging to the greater houses and several of the places are entered twice over in different counties.‡ Of the various counties affected, York-

* Strype, “ *Ecc. Mems.*,” ed. 1822, p. 395. The patent for the continuance of Stixwold is dated 9th July, a^o 29 Hen. VIII. (1537). “ *Rot. Pat.*,” 29 Hen. VIII., Part i., m. 29. The letter is evidence that much more was required by the royal founder than the sum acknowledged as received in the roll of the treasurer of the augmentation office.

† *Calendar*, x., 1238.

‡ The actual number of monasteries accounted for by the receivers from Michaelmas, 1535, to Michaelmas, 1537, is 243

shire, including Richmond, had the most, numbering in all 20 convents of women, 25 houses of men and eight cells dependent on the greater abbeys. Lincolnshire contained within its borders 37 houses which came within the operation of this act of dissolution.

In respect to the annual value of the property passed to the king by these suppressions, the estimate given by Stowe and others is probably correct. The total given in the contemporary list above referred to is £28,858 19s. 10 $\frac{3}{4}$ d,* and the difference is perhaps accounted for by the values of other monasteries which before the passing of the act, or subsequently by surrender or otherwise, had about this time passed into the king's possession. Indeed, lord Herbert puts the value at "about £30,000 or £32,000,"† the former figure not differing materially from the estimate given above. Of this sum, a very large proportion came from the lands of the Yorkshire monasteries, being no less than £3,460 11s. 1d., and the almost equal amount of £3,062 8s. 0 $\frac{1}{2}$ d. from those in Lincolnshire. It will be seen subse-

(Exch. Augt. Office Mins. Accts., ann. 27-28 Hen. VIII., and ann. 28-29 Hen. VIII.). The first accounts of some are missing, but in this number are included others which had fallen into the king's hands by surrender, like Abingdon, or by attainder, like Whalley and Barlings. This number, 243, together with the 123 stated in the original document published by Stevens (*Monast. ii., Append., pp. 17-19*) to have been respited, comes sufficiently near to the number above stated.

* It is added up in a later hand incorrectly £29,041 os. 3 $\frac{1}{2}$ d.

† Ed., 1683, p. 441.

quently how these promises of large annual receipts from the confiscated estates proved illusory, and in spite of the rack-renting of the crown farmers, the monastic acres furnished less money for the royal purse than they did under the thrifty management and personal supervision of their former owners.

As for the spoils of the religious houses, consisting of money, plate and jewels, which were sent in kind into the king's treasury, and the proceeds of the sales of lead, bells, stock, furniture and even buildings, it is clear that lord Herbert, following Stowe's estimate of these "Robin Hood's pennyworth's," has placed the amount received at too high a figure. It is, of course, undeniable that these goods were worth much more than the £100,000 at which they were estimated; but, as will be seen later, nothing like that sum was received by the royal treasury, or, at least acknowledged by Sir Thomas Pope as having been obtained from the sales of the lesser monasteries. Corruption, without doubt, existed everywhere, from the lowest attendant of the visiting commissioner to the highest official in the court of Augmentation, whose high salary might be supposed to have raised him above a suspicion of dishonesty; but allowing for the numberless ways in which the royal revenue could be robbed, it seems, judging by the paltry sums realized by the sales of monastic effects, that an average of £260 or £270 for each house would be altogether too high.

Previous to the passing of the act which authorized

this wholesale suppression, some few houses had already come into the king's hands. Few though they were, it was yet clearly thought necessary to cover the illegality of these suppressions by a retrospective clause in the act. There were some seven which appear to have thus been dissolved before the meeting of parliament. Three houses, those of Langdon, Folkestone and Dover, had been appropriated as early as the November of the previous year, 1535, and the cause of the surrenders as stated on the Close roll is, that they were burdened with debt,* and were thus unable to continue any longer. Whilst on their northern visitation in February, Layton and Legh procured the surrender of two of the Yorkshire houses. On the 7th of that month Dr. Layton wrote to Crumwell from York: "This, 7th Feb., I have been with the archbishop, to whom I have delivered your letters, and have received another from him for you to nominate your clerk for the monk's prebend. This day I had been at Fountains to make the election, but that I tarry in York to induce a lewd canon and his flock, if possible, to surrender his house of £140 good lands and only 40 marks of it in spiritual tithes. I had contrived," he adds, "this matter long before now, if a little false knave in York had not been a 'dog-garell' of the law and a 'pursevant' of Westminster Hall." † This house which Layton was anxious to

* "Rot. Claus.," 27 Hen. VIII., Pars. i., 27, 28, 29.

† Calendar, x., 271.

obtain, and in which design he was almost check-mated by the "little false knave," was Marton, a priory of Austin canons near York. Two days later his wish was gratified, and he received the surrender; a few days later still, he and Dr. Legh took the resignation of the priory of Hornby, in Lancashire. This was a poor place, and had even to borrow a seal from a neighbouring abbey with which to seal their doom.* Two other monasteries in the south of England, Bilsington in Kent, and Tiltey in Essex, both much in debt, complete the list of houses which had fallen into Henry's hands before the dissolution was made legal by the parliament. In the case of the latter, Tiltey, it was agreed by Richard Crumwell, who conducted the dissolution, that the abbot, John Palmer, and his five brethren should remain in their house for the time. That the servants were to be retained, and the abbot continue "to support Alice, his mother, Agnes Lucas, widow, and Thomas Ewen, impotent persons," for which purpose Crumwell left him sixty shillings. The plate, consisting of "a cross and a senser of silver and gilt, a ship with a spoon, a salt with cover, 3 maser bonds, and 10 spoons," the commissioner took away with him, except half a dozen spoons which he left for the use of the abbot. The furniture of the house is described as poor enough, that of the best parlour consisting only of "2 tables, 4 trestles, 1 turned chair, 2 painted

* "Rot. Claus.," 27 Hen. VIII., Pars. i., 38.

cloths, 2 pieces of old saye, and 2 forms of planks." The vestments, however, for their church appear to have been more costly than the poverty of the house would suggest.

It is impossible to form any proper estimate of the number of persons affected by the dissolution of the lesser monasteries. Besides the monks and nuns that were turned out of their houses and lost their support, and the number of servants, farm labourers and others, to whom these houses gave employment and means of subsistence, there must have been a vast number of men and women whose means of livelihood were more or less dependent upon the religious houses. Putting the latter class altogether on one side, it is possible that the calculation given by Stowe, that "10,000 people, masters and servants, had lost their livings by the putting down of these houses at that time," is not too high an estimate. From the particulars given in the returns of the royal commissioners it is known, that in the twenty-one religious houses for which their certificates exist, there was an average number of at least eight members in each monastery and convent, and that each house had some twenty-seven people besides, directly dependent upon it. Taking the number of the lesser monasteries at only 350, and the average number of religious inmates at only six, it will be seen that over two thousand monks and nuns were at this time dispossessed. By the same method of calculation, it will appear that between

nine and ten thousand people were direct dependents of the monasteries dissolved.

Of course the work was not accomplished without some earnest protests and some endeavours to deter the king from continuing his work of destruction and desolation. Thus no sooner was the passing of the act made known than Crumwell received letters from persons begging his good offices with Henry, for the preservation of houses in which the writers were specially interested. Sir Piers Edgecombe, for example, writes that "here is much communication and bruits that all abbeys, priories, and nunneries under the clear value of £200 shall be suppressed, notwithstanding it is not as yet in these parts openly known the occasion of suppression, nor who shall take most benefit thereby, nor to what use it shall rest at length." He then goes on to say, that he is the founder of the priory of Totnes and the convent of Cornworthy, in Devonshire, both under £200 a year, and as the prior of Totnes is a man of "virtuous conversation and a good viander" he thinks it right to tell the king's secretary.* In the same way lord de la Ware begs for Boxgrave, and trusts it may be spared, as many of his ancestors and his wife's mother lie there. The parish church is under the roof of the church of the monastery, and there, he adds, I have made "a poor chapel to be buried in."†

* Wright, "Supp. of Monast.," Camden Soc., p. 117.

† *Ibid.*, 119.

Nor did the monasteries themselves quietly wait for the royal commissioners to dispossess them of their effects. There are many indications of goods and even plate being turned into money, often no doubt with a view of obtaining the means of subsistence. Thus as early as March 27th, shortly after the passing of the act, it is reported to Crumwell that the house of Marham nunnery, in Norfolk, had been stripped of all the lead and left uncovered and bare. Richard Southwell, the writer, also says that the convents of "Blackborough, Shouldham and Crabhouse make away with all they can, and make such pennyworths as they are not able to pay any part of their debts, so that all the goods will be dispersed." The writer concludes by a petition for Pentney: "We beseech your favour," he writes, "for the prior of Pentney,* assuring you that he relieves those quarters wondrously where he dwells, and it would be a pity not to spare a house that feeds so many indigent poor, which is in a good state, maintains good service, and does so many charitable deeds. We hear that great labour will be made unto the king for the same and large offers, the rather because the house is new made throughout and no house in the shire stands so commodiously. If you will prevent it, your labour will not be without remembrance."†

* He was one of the monks defamed by Layton and Legh in the *comperta*.

† Calendar, x., 563.

One other document addressed to the king giving reasons for the continuance of Carmarthen priory may be here given as possessing considerable interest. It is urged that "at the first survey for the tenth" the yearly value was returned as £209, and it was by the fault of the commissioners that it was "presented as being under £200. 2. Beside the twelve canons, whereof four died but lately, there are daily and commonly found by the said priory about 80 persons. 3. The house is well built and in good repair. 4. As to the behaviour of the brethren, they refer to the report of the country and the commissioners. 5. The priory stands in Camarthen, a notable market-town and common thoroughfare, and a great number of people have their meat and drink in the said house. 6. As there is but little good lodging for noblemen resorting to these parts on the king's or other business, the house is an open lodging for all such. 7. Hospitality is daily kept for poor and rich, which is a great relief to the country, being poor and bare. 8. Weekly alms are given to 80 poor people, which, if the house were suppressed, they would want. These charges are maintained more by good husbandry and provision of the house than by its revenues, which stand mostly in spiritualities. 9. When Henry VII. came to this country the prior made a new lodging for him, which is meet for the king or the prince if they happen to come to those parts. 10. Strangers and merchantmen resorting to those parts are honestly

received and entertained, whereby they are the gladder to bring their commodities to that country. The king of Portugal thanked the house under his great seal for entertaining his merchants."*

In the middle of the year 1537 the king refounded one or two monasteries which had been suppressed. This was a different and more solemn act than the permission which had been accorded to some to continue undissolved and to which reference has been made. On the 9th July, for example, he granted a charter of foundation to a convent of Premonstratensian nuns, to which he had given the site of the convent of Stixwold. It was ordered to be called "the new monastery of king Henry VIII.," and a grant in mortmain was made to Mary Missenden, who was appointed prioress "of the ground and site of the church, bell tower, churchyard, bells, ornaments, etc.," of the monastery of Stixwold, to be held at a rent to the crown of £15 5s., "which is the true tenth." †

In the same way, on December 18th of this same year, Henry united several monasteries in one foundation at Bisham. William Barlow, bishop of St. David's and commendatory prior of Bisham, had surrendered that house to the king in July, 1536. A year later the abbey of Chertsey passed into the royal power by the act of the abbot and monks, and six months after, the abbot, "in consideration that

* Calendar, x., 1246.

† "Rot. Pat.," 29 Hen. VIII., Pars. i., 29.

the said John Cordrey, late abbot and convent of Chertsey, had granted their possessions and monastery to the king," received a charter incorporating that house with a monastery the king desired to found at Bisham. It was to consist of an abbot and thirteen Benedictine monks, who were to pray for the king and queen Jane, and was to be called "King Henry VIII. new monastery of Holy Trinity, Bisham." The king also granted to Cordrey his royal permission "to wear a mitre like any other abbot of that order with large possessions in England."*

It is touching to see how some of the monks plead for permission to continue their religious life. To take but one example. On the 9th of June, 1536, the abbot of Waverley writes to Crumwell: "Pleaseth your mastership I received your letters of the 7th day of this present month, and have endeavoured myself to accomplish the contents of them, and have sent your mastership the true extent, value and account of our said monastery. Beseeching your good mastership, for the love of Christ's passion, to help me in the preservation of this poor monastery, that we your beadsmen may remain in the service of God with the meanest living that any poor men may live with in this world. So to continue in the service of Almighty Jesus, and to pray for the estate of our prince and your mastership. In no vain hope I write this to your mastership, forasmuch you put me

* "Rot. Pat." 29 Hen. VIII., Pars. iv., m. 12.

in such boldness full gently, when I was in suit to you last year at Winchester, saying, 'Repair to me for such business as ye shall have from time to time.' Therefore, instantly praying you, and my poor brethren with weeping, yes!—desire you to help them; in this world no creatures in more trouble, and so we remain depending upon the comfort that shall come to us from you—serving God daily at Waverley."*

Meantime the progress of the dissolution went on apace. From the 12th May, 1536, when Calwich, in Staffordshire, a cell of the Augustinian monastery of Kenilworth, was taken by the commissioners as the first-fruits of the coming harvest, the work of destruction did not cease. On June 1st John Freeman wrote to Crumwell that he hoped to "bring a profitable inventory to the king worth £1000 in one shire, not reckoning Gilbertines nor cells which are ten houses. Of these," he continues, "I reckon a great part in lead and bells, not including woods. For other moveables they have left their houses meetly bare, nor can we make them bring all things to light."†

So quickly was the work accomplished that by July 8th Chapuys was able to write:—"It is a lamentable thing to see a legion of monks and nuns, who have been chased from their monasteries, wandering miserably hither and thither seeking means to live; and several honest men have told me that,

* Calendar, x., 1097.

† Calendar, x., 1026.

what with monks, nuns and persons dependent on the monasteries suppressed, there were over, 20,000 who knew not how to live."*

Everywhere throughout the country the same scenes were being enacted. The thoroughness of Henry's policy was brought home to the people by the same sickening story of destruction, wanton waste, pilfering, pillage and mock auctions worse than plain pilfering, going on up and down the land. As for the ejected monks and nuns themselves, to use Mr. Gairdner's words, "The full degree of hardship arising out of the king's proceedings was perhaps difficult even in that day to estimate—impossible in ours."†

Some of the religious, however, did not take the spoliation of their houses as quietly as the abbot of Waverley. Even before the general rising in Lincolnshire the canons of Hexham absolutely refused to be suppressed by the king's officers. They had apparently a good cause, for archbishop Lee had begged that their house might be spared, and it seems his request was granted, since, as will appear, they received a grant under the great seal to continue. Their bold Northumbrian spirit could not submit calmly to what they must have regarded as

* Calendar, xi., No. 42. Mr. Gairdner upon this (Preface xii.), says:—"The estimate may possibly have referred to the ultimate effects of the act, though the previous statement shows that the results were painful enough already. For as yet not half the work could have been done."

† Calendar, xi., Pref. xiv.

most unjust resolutions of a parliament composed of Henry's creatures. The story of their successful resistance is of great interest.* It is found in a report upon "the misdemeanours of the religious persons of Hexham in the County of Northumberland. First," runs this valuable record, "whereas Lionel Gray, Robert Collingwood, William Green, and James Rokeby, commissioners for the dissolution of the monasteries within the county aforesaid, the 28th day of the month of September, in the 28th year of the reign of our sovereign lord king Henry VIII. (1536) associated with their ordinary company, were riding towards the said monastery of Hexham, there to execute the king's most dread commandment of dissolution. Being in their journey at Delston, 3 miles from the same monastery (they) were credibly informed that the said religious persons had prepared them with guns and artillery meet for war, with people in the same house and to defend and keep the same with force." (Upon this report they) "assented that the said Lionel Gray and Robert Collingwood should with a few persons repair to the same monastery, as well to view and see the number of persons keeping the same house as to desire the subprior and convent of the same thankfully and obediently to receive the king's commis-

* Calendar, xi., 504. Printed in canon Raine's "Priory of Hexham," Surtees' Society, Appendix p. cxxvii., etc., from the MS. collections of the late Rev. John Hodgson. The story is well told in the excellent preface to that volume.

sioners, coming near at hand to enter into their house, with due entertainment, there to execute and use the effect of their duties of dissolution, according to the king's most dread commandment. The said Lionel and Robert accordingly did enter into the said town of Hexham. Riding towards the said monastery (they) did see many persons assembled with bills, halberts, and other defenceable weapons, ready standing in the street, like men ready to defend a town of war. And in their passing by the street, the common bell of the town was rung, and straight after the sound of it the great bell in the monastery was likewise rung, whereby the people forceably assembled towards the monastery where the said Lionel and Robert found the gates and doors fast shut. And a canon, called the master of Ovingham, belonging to the same house, being in harness, with a bow bent with arrows, accompanied with divers other persons, all standing upon the leads and walls of the house and steeple. This master of Ovingham answered these words hereunder written: 'We be 20 brethren in this house and we shall die all, or that ye shall have the house.'"

"The said Lionel and Robert answered with a request, and said:—'Advise you well and speak with your brethren, and show unto them this our request and declaration of the king's gracious writings, and then give us answer finally.' And so the master departed into the house. After his depar-

ture did come into the same place five or six of the canons of the house with divers other persons, like men of war in harness with swords girt about them, having bows and arrows and other weapons, and stood upon the steeple head and leads in the defence of their house, the said Lionel and Robert being without. About whom did come and congregate many people, both men with weapons and many women, and stood there a great space, assured by the said master of Ovingham that they should remain peaceably there until their answer were made and so to depart without bodily hurt.

“ The said master of Ovingham being in harness with the subprior, being in his canon’s apparel, not long after did repair again to the said Lionel and Robert, bringing with them a writing under the king’s broad seal, and said these words hereafter written, by the mouth of the subprior:—‘ We do not doubt but ye bring with you the king’s seal of authority for this house, albeit ye shall see here the king’s confirmation of our house under the great seal of king Henry VIII. God save his grace! We think it not the king’s honour to give forth one seal contrary to another, and before any either of our lands, goods or house be taken from us we shall all die; and that is our full answer.’ And so the said Lionel and Robert returned and met the rest of the commissioners approaching near the town. And so all together recoiled back to Corbridge, **where they lay all that night.**”

Next day they learnt " that immediately after the commissioners departed the town, the canons being all in harness, associated with a great company of tenants and servants belonging to the said monastery to the number of 60 persons and more, did issue forth of the monastery in defenceable array, by two together, all in harness, and so did walk from the monastery to a place called the green, towards where the commissioners did meet, and there stood in array with their weapons in their hands until the commissioners were past out of sight of the monastery. And so returned into the monastery again."

It would seem that from the 28th of September, when the royal commissioners were driven away, till the 15th of October, the canons held the monastery by force of arms. After that they wavered in their determination, and said, " that the abbey should be delivered to the king's commissioners to be ordered at their pleasure, so that they might there serve God and remain, though they begged for their livings." Their message of submission, however, was not taken to the king, and Hexham remained untouched till on the final suppression of the Pilgrimage of Grace they could be dealt with. Probably many of the canons suffered for their temerity in resisting the royal will, for Hexham is mentioned by name in Henry's letter to the duke of Norfolk, as one of the places where the monks " are to be tied up without further delay or

ceremony." * Prior Jay, who is not mentioned in the account of the resistance offered to the suppression, was possibly, like so many superiors at this time, a crown nominee. He alone received the grant of a pension when Hexham finally fell into the hands of Henry in March, 1537.†

* Lemon's St. Papers, i., 537.

† Exch. Augt. Off. Mins. Accts., 28-29 Hen. VIII., 200 m. 4d. The grant is dated 10 March, anno 28. Canon Raine says that tradition has it he was hanged at the gate of his monastery. This possibly was the subprior. It could not have been prior Jay.

CHAPTER II.

THE RISING IN LINCOLNSHIRE.

THE resistance offered to the royal commissioners at Hexham was an indication of the popular disapproval of Henry's measures. Before punishment could be dealt out to the hardy northerners, and even within a few days of the affair at Hexham, the smouldering flame of discontent had burst into the full blaze of open defiance in Lincolnshire. No part of England had a worse reputation for disorder, and the crown records for a long period previously afford ample proof of the bold and turbulent spirit of the inhabitants of the fen lands and its adjacent districts. They were the last people in England to see changes which they could not approve taking place in their midst without making an endeavour to stay the course of events by an appeal to arms.

Only one other county had been so greatly affected by the late act of parliament which had dissolved the lesser monasteries. By this measure some seven-and-thirty religious houses in Lincolnshire passed into the king's possession, and a rental of more than £3,000 a year, which had hitherto been spent in the county

and, in a great measure at least, for the good of the people, was transferred to the royal purse for the vague purpose of augmenting the crown revenues.

The full meaning of this change must have come home in a very practical way to almost every class in the county. Not only were a large number of monks and nuns rendered homeless, and a still greater number of their dependents, deprived of their means of livelihood, become outcasts and beggars, but the clergy, who were vicars of livings appropriated to the dissolved monasteries, must have been uncertain whether they could count upon their stipends, now that the greater tithes had passed into the hands of the royal officials. The poor, also, long dependent on the charity and assistance of the religious, must have regarded the movement with feelings akin to despair, whilst even those, who had been accustomed to relief left them by dead benefactors, and of which the monks had been the careful guardians, would have known that their trusts had likewise been swept away into the capacious purse of Henry. Thus, for example, the nine parishioners of Billesley could no longer expect to receive the wheat, beans and oats, nor those of Stikeford the annual payments, which a charitable man had left to the Augustinians of Markby priory in trust for them. Nor could the poor gathered round the dismantled walls of Humberstone hope any longer to receive the corn which, from the foundation of their house centuries before, the Benedictine monks had distributed on the feast

of St. Thomas the apostle. Nor again could those at Vaudrey expect to get the bread and beer given away each Lent time, nor those at Newsted be asked to pray for the souls of the kings Henry II. and John, who, as founders of that house, had left an annual alms to the neighbouring poor for that special purpose, although the entire income of the house was but £42 a year.*

In no part of England, moreover, was the ugly business of gathering in the spoils pushed on with greater vigour than in Lincolnshire. By the feast of St. Michael, 1536, or in six months from the passing of the act of dissolution, John Freeman, the royal receiver for the district, was able to account for a large sum to the treasurer of the court of augmentation. His receipts from the sales of the religious houses, including buildings, furniture, lead, bells, with stocks and moveables of all kinds, had reached the high total of £7,484 os. 4 $\frac{3}{4}$ d., or, in round figures, some £75,000 of our present money, to which a further sum of nearly £200 was to be added for "pictures, clocks," and other precious articles sold subsequently. Altogether, with rents and other items of receipt, John Freeman admitted having obtained for the king in the first six months no less a sum than £8,756 11s. 9 $\frac{3}{4}$ d., of which about one fourth part had been paid away in the process of dissolution.†

* "Valor Eccl.," iv., pp. 51, 68, 72-99.

† Exch. Augt. Office Mins. Accts, 27-28 Hen. VIII., No. 166.

It is, of course, impossible that the people could have witnessed the desecration of the monastic churches, the sales of the sacred vestments, the carrying away of the altar plate to the royal treasure house, and the expulsion of the religious from monastery and convent without deep and angry feelings. They argued, rightly, as the event proved, that a power which could proceed to such extremities against ecclesiastical rights would not stop here, and that gradually the treasuries of parish churches would be searched and emptied to satisfy a greed which would only be whetted by the spoils already carried away from the monastic houses. Other causes of discontent were at work on the popular mind. The religious changes, and in particular the renunciation of papal authority at the royal pleasure, were eminently distasteful to the nation at large. The ecclesiastical appointments made by Henry, especially those of bishops regarded by the Catholic instincts of the people as heretics and false pastors, had stirred up a feeling of resentment ready to burst out on the slightest provocation; and the late enactments of Henry's parliament about property appeared to attack a long-established right as to the free disposal of acquired estates and to destroy the possibility of making provision by will for the support of the younger members of a family.

Just at this time three commissions were issued by the crown which singly might have tried the

temper of a nation, but which combined were irritating beyond the limits of popular self-control. In the autumn of 1534 a subsidy or tax of two and a half per cent. on all incomes of more than £20 a year had been voted by the parliament. The first part had been paid, and the second now being due, the royal officials were endeavouring to enforce the payment and to push their inquisitorial demands for the correct returns of income.

At the same time other commissioners were busy conducting the work of suppressing the lesser monasteries. With bands of retainers and workmen imported from distant places, they were carrying on the forced sales, dismantling the conventual churches and other buildings, and dispatching convoys with plate and muniments to London, or with the lead of church roofs and gutters melted into fadders and pigs, or the metal of broken bells to some place, where they were to be stored for use or sale.

Simultaneously a third set of royal agents were busy carrying round certain injunctions, which Crumwell, as vicar-general in spirituals, had made for the clergy at large. Their powers were extensive, and were intensely disliked by those whom they most concerned. They were directed, to call before them every individual parish priest, to inquire into his character, habits and reputation, to examine into his qualifications and learning, and to dismiss from their cures those they considered unfit.

As might be expected, rumours were busily circu-

lated which served to inflame the popular mind. According to the declaration of the abbot of Barlings, for about a month or six weeks before Michaelmas day, 1536, reports were going about the country "that two or three parish churches should be put in one." Also "that about the same time, it was likewise bruited that all chalices, crosses and other jewels of the church should be taken away from the same churches and chalices of tin should be given to the said churches in lieu of them;" also "that all manner of gold coined and uncoined should be brought to the Tower of London to be touched."* According to another witness, it was commonly said at this time that the churches were to be destroyed, "that all the abbeys of England should be suppressed save only the monastery of Westminster. And further . . . that all the jewels of the church, that is to say crosses, chalices, censers should be taken away from the churches and chalices crosses and censers of tin put in their places."†

The first outbreak of the storm took place at Louth.‡ By the close of September the monastery of Louth-park had been dissolved, and the people

* Chapt. House Bk., A. $\frac{2}{29}$, p. 12.

† *Ibid.*, p. 25. In this declaration, as to the popular belief that Henry coveted the treasures of the parish churches, all the numerous witnesses examined as to the rising agree.

‡ Only a slight sketch of both the Lincolnshire rising and the Pilgrimage of Grace is here attempted, in so far as they bear upon the question of the dissolution of monasteries. Unfortunately it was finished before the publication of the eleventh volume of Mr. Gairdner's "Calendar."

had witnessed the sales of the ornaments and vestments of the church, which, together with the other effects of the place, realized close upon the large sum of a thousand pounds.* At the feast of St. Michael the process of dissolution was going on at the convent of Legbourne, just outside the town, and two of Crumwell's servants, Millicent and John Bellow, had been left by the commissioners to complete the work.

On Saturday, the last day of September, Dr. Raynes, chancellor of the bishop of Lincoln, held a court of examination at Bolingbroke, and the priests of the district had been much exercised by his inquiries. According to the declaration of a former monk of Louth-park it was the chancellor's scribe, Peter, who fanned the spark into flame by "recommending the priests to study up their books, for they should have straight examination taken of them shortly."† One was heard to say:—"They will deprive us of our benefices because they would have the first-fruits."‡ Another declared that "they would not be ordered nor yet examined of their ability in learning or otherwise in keeping of cure of souls."§ And the parson of Farforthe, Simon Maltby, "returned home to his parish and reported amongst his neighbours that the church goods should be

* Exch. Augt. Off. Mins. Accts., 27-28 Hen. VIII., 81, m. 43.

† Chapt. H. Bk., A. $\frac{2}{29}$, p. 143.

‡ *Ibid.*

§ *Ibid.*, A. $\frac{2}{28}$, p. 8.

taken from them." He also said that "there were divers chalices made of tin which should be delivered to them in exchange for their silver chalices, and the said silver chalices to be had to the king's use. And further the said Sir Simon said, that he with other priests were determined that if the said chancellor did sit any more they would strike him down, trusting that their neighbours would take their parts in that behalf."*

The report that the king was going to take possession of all church plate was fully believed on all sides. "One William Man that singeth bass in the choir at Louth and parson Sotbye going to board with Thomas Manby at Louth," just before the rising, said, that "the common fame was that the inhabitants of the town of Hull had sold the church stuff to prevent the king's commissioners."† And whilst dining at Grimsby a sailor, "a very tall man having a tall woman for his wife," was heard to say:—"We hear at Hull that ye should have a visitation here shortly and therefore we have taken all our church plate and jewels and sold them and paved our town withal. And so, if ye be wise, will ye do too and mend your town, which is foul withal."‡

There were, however, other matters which moved the people more deeply than any question about their church plate. Kendal, the vicar of Louth, declared that there was much grumbling about the supremacy question, although he could not give the

* *Ibid.*, p. 7. † *Ibid.*, A. 2^o, p. 3. ‡ *Ibid.*, p. 144.

names of those who "murmured that the king's highness should be head of the church." And also that "all men with whom he had any communication did grudge and murmur at the new opinions touching our Lady and Purgatory, and himself also did grudge at the same. Item," runs the record of the vicar's examination in the Tower, "he saith it was reported, that the sacrament was irreverently taken down at Hagneby by the king's officers at the time of the suppression and dissolution of the same house."*

It is impossible to inspect the depositions of witnesses and examinations of prisoners on this matter, without a conviction that the men of Lincolnshire rose in arms in defence of what they held to be matters of both Christian faith and practice. The vicar of Louth advised them most strongly "in no wise to meddle with the king's highness, but only for the repression of heresies and maintenance of the faith of Christ."† They regarded Cromwell and some of the bishops as banded together to destroy the Catholic faith, and they were loud in their demands for their punishment. "Item," said one witness, "they intended if they might have prospered in their journey to have slain the lord Cromwell, four or five of the bishops, the master of the Rolls, and the chancellor of the Augmentations." Also—and to this part of the examination an ominous hand with a finger pointing is placed in the

* *Ibid.*, p. 3.

† *Ibid.*, p. 6.

margin with the remark, "note this specially"—the gentlemen "demanded of the commons whether they would have the lord Crumwell and others before named, saying to them: 'The lord Crumwell was a false traitor, and that he and the same bishops and master of the Rolls and the chancellor of Augmentations—calling them two false pen clerks—were the very imaginers and devisers of all the false laws.'"* Another declared, that the articles devised at Horn-castle "much concerned Crumwell, the chancellor of the Augmentations, the bishop of Rochester, the bishop of Dublin, the bishop of Canterbury and the bishop of Lincoln and other more, who were the devisers of taking away the church goods and pulling down of churches."† And a letter to chancellor Audeley, written during the commotion, tells him that most of the people of Lincolnshire "are persuaded that they cannot die in a better quarrel." As to their demands, the writer concludes, "one is, as far as I can know or learn, they will that the Church of England shall have all such privileges as they have had by old custom, without any exaction: another is, that all the houses of religion that are suppressed be restored, except such houses as the king hath suppressed for his pleasure only: the third is, to have the bishop of Canterbury, the bishop of Rochester, bishop Latimer, the bishop of Lincoln, the bishop of Ely and divers other, and also my lord Privy seal, the master of the Rolls, Mr. chancellor of

* *Ibid.*, p. 28.

† *I d.* p. 33.

the Augmentations delivered unto them, or else banished the realm for ever."*

Against Crumwell in particular the feeling of the priests and people was extremely bitter. One priest is accused of saying, that "the king's most noble counsel were false harlots in devising of false laws for spoiling the goods of the spirituality, and named the procurement thereof to be the lord Crumwell,"† and many threats of personal violence are recorded as being uttered against him. Altogether there can be no doubt, that the people, as one witness has it, "called my lord privy seal most vilipendiously at their pleasure."‡

Besides the religious questions there were also social matters which irritated the people at this time. Parliament, in the last session but one, had passed the celebrated "Statute of Uses."§ Up to this time, land had not been subject to disposition by will, but this bar to the free disposal of real property had been practically removed by a system of "uses" or "trusts," under cover of which it had been the practice to make provision for younger children, for the payment of debts and for other charges, which were often tantamount to a transfer of such property. The king's anxiety in the passing of the "Statute of Uses" was to prevent the failure of his feudal dues. Some three years before the measure passed into law, he had endeavoured to effect what he wanted by

* *Ibid.*, B. 3, f. 116 d.

† *Ibid.*, A. 28, p. 5.

‡ *Ibid.*, A. 29, p. 169.

§ 27 Hen. VIII., Cap. 10.

a measure relating to "wardships." The chronicler Hall relates an interview which Henry had with the speaker and the commons as to this bill.

"I have sent you," he said, "a 'bill' concerning wardships and primer seisin, in which things I am greatly wronged. In this I have offered you reason, as I think, and as the lords do too; for they have passed the bill and set their hands to it. Therefore, I do assure you, that if you will not take a reasonable thing when it is offered, I will search out the extremity of the law, and then I will not offer so much again."

The royal offer made was, in exchange for the better security of the crown wardships, to allow a testamentary power over half any real estate. But, as the nation had, through the practice of "uses," long assumed the right of disposing of all such property, the bargain, practically so far from granting anything, took away the accustomed power of disposal. Henry, finding great reluctance to pass his bill, determined to "search out the extremity of the law," and by the "Statute of Uses" to abolish wills entirely.*

* Lord St. Leonards, in his preface to *Gilbert*, observes that "in comparing what the Statute of Uses was intended to perform, with what it actually has performed, one can hardly doubt that any other legislative measure which opposed the confirmed habits of the people in disposing of their property, would have led to the same results. This should operate as a lesson to the legislature, not vainly to oppose the current of 'general opinion; for, although diverted for a time, it will ultimately regain its old channel, in spite of accumulated acts of parliament."—*Vide* Amos, "Statutes of Henry VIII.," p. 122.

The preamble of the act directed against "uses" was divided into a discussion of *causes* and *effects*. As regards wills, it may be observed that a few years later, in the 32nd year of Henry's reign, all the objections urged in this preamble were withdrawn and the statute of wills pronounced them to be beneficial, not hurtful, to the common interest of the state. "In this, the most important of Henry's acts concerning real property," writes Amos, "he seems to have been actuated chiefly, if not entirely, by his appetency for the fruits of feudal tenure. He did not 'call to his blessed remembrance,' the impolicy and hardship of such exactions; but in order to appropriate them with greater security, he studied to cast back his people in the progress of civilization by divesting property of several of its principal attractions, in abolishing all kinds of trusts, and the power of making a will of lands. He was willing to sacrifice the interests of creditors, widows, daughters, younger sons, throughout the land, in order that he might revel in the plunder of his tenants *in capite*, their heirs and heiresses."*

The statute was unpopular with all classes. It was said that the duke of Norfolk openly expressed disapproval of the measure. "One Thomas Pope informed the council," writes lord Herbert, "that John Freeman told him, that the duke (at Nottingham in the time of the commotion of the north)

* *Ibid.*

should say in the presence of an hundred persons, that the Act of Uses was the worst act that ever was made."* Lord De la Ware told a priest, at the time of the passing of the statute, "it was a very sore act, and that he grudged much at it,"† and it was three gentlemen who suggested to the people at Horncastle the necessity of demanding some change in this law. Mr. Sheriff Dymmoke said to them :—" Masters, men cannot now make their wills, for if they make a will now and happen to die twenty or thirty years after the making thereof the same will shall stand and the testator shall not at any time after the making of the same will change anything contained therein." "And also they said," declared the witness, "that the eldest son should have all the lands and the father should not be at liberty to give his youngest son any of his lands although they were purchased."‡ Another of the persons present at the gathering said that the sheriff told them, that "the eldest son must have all his father's lands and no person to the payment of his debt, neither to the advancement of his daughter's marriages can do anything with their lands." He adds that before this neither he, nor, as he believes, any of the people "knew what that Act of Uses meant."§

The populace were thus at this time thoroughly roused by the temporal and spiritual innovations

* Hen. VIII., ed. 1683, p. 626. † St. Papers Dom., Box U., 338.
 ‡ Chapt. House Bk., A. 27, p. 26. § *Ibid.*, p. 31.

which they were compelled to witness. In Lincolnshire also extensive suppressions of religious houses coming at this time, in conjunction with the constant reports of yet further destruction and desecration of churches, and of the greater seizure of ecclesiastical property meditated by Henry, determined the people to have recourse to arms for the preservation of the rights of church and nation.

The story of the rising may be best told in the words of those who were present, and which are preserved in the depositions of witnesses and the examination of prisoners after the close of the rebellion. "Sir William Moreland, priest, late monk of Louth Park," deposed* that he was a monk in the abbey up to the 8th of September, 1536, and that on "Holy Rood day (14th September) next following" he had received his capacity, "and ever since then hath gone in secular habit, saving at such time as he was at Pomfret with sir Robert Constable, when he did wear their white jacket and a scapulary." After leaving his monastery, he had lodged at the house "of one Thomas Wrightson of Kedington," a little village about a quarter of a mile from his old religious home, and had only been away twice, when he went to a house in Louth "to meet two or three of his late brethren."

"About three weeks before Michaelmas," this exiled monk declares, "a great rumour was busily spoken (specially after the commissary's visitation

* Chapter House Bk., A. 2^d, pp. 91 to 129.

kept at Louth church, in Saint Peter's choir, by one Master Peter, then scribe to the commissary of Lincoln) that the chalices of parish churches should be taken away, and that there should be but one parish church within six or seven miles compass. Also, that every parson and vicar should be examined and tried by their learning whether they were able and sufficient of their learning to have and take upon themselves the cure of souls or not. Where-with this deponent was right glad, and thought to himself that it might perchance be his fortune to succeed some of such unlettered parsons or vicars in some of their rooms.

“And the Monday (2nd October) next after Michaelmas day, as this deponent remembereth, the said inquiry and visitation should have been kept at Louth aforesaid. And the same Sunday (1st October) when the insurrection first began at Louth, he rode forth by four o'clock in the morning on a bay gelding, which he borrowed of one Dane Thomas Lilborne, late subprior of Louth-park, and so rode on to Markby and Hagneby to deliver there certain ‘capacities’ to the number ten, into divers of the brethren of the monasteries there also late suppressed. And the same afternoon about three o'clock he came home again to Kedington. And then he heard say that the vicar of Louth, called Kendall, had made a certain collation* that same Sunday unto his parishioners, in which, amongst

* *i.e.*, sermon or address.

other things he advised them to go together and to look well on such things as should be inquired of on the next morrow at the visitation. And the same Sunday at evensong (as this deponent heard say, for he was not thereat), the parishioners 'commoning' amongst themselves of the premises, the head men of the parish and the poor men all together, or the most part of them, at last fell at such diversity of sundry opinions amongst themselves that in conclusion, the poor men took the keys of the church from the rich men and churchwardens there, and said they would keep the keys themselves. And that night, he heard say, that the parishioners did put into the church to keep the same 10 or 12 of their neighbours."

On the Monday morning, Moreland, after having "said matins," hearing of the disturbance of the night before, went into Louth to make inquiries. "And then," he continues, "this deponent would have gone into the church to hear mass, but such of the parishioners as kept the church would not suffer him nor none other to enter into the same, but only such as they liked." Not being able to hear his mass, he retired "from the church unto the house of one William Hert, a butcher," where, amongst others, he met one of his old brethren of Louth-park, "Robert Hert." They, of course, discussed the events of the previous evening, "and as they sat together there at breakfast with puddings, suddenly the common bell was rung by such as were within the said church."

At the sound of the alarm the people rushed towards the church, where its meaning was soon discovered, by the appearance of John Heneage, "the proctor," who had ridden into the town and been seized by the excited populace, who would have killed him. Some of the better disposed, however, hurried him to the church, where they managed to get him into the choir, "and to lock the door between him and the commons." He was, however, forced to take the oath to be true to God and the people. Nicholas Melton, "whom afterwards they named captain Cobler," was the chief leader of the people at this time.

Hardly had this excitement somewhat subsided than, as the people were turning home, "suddenly, at the coming into the town of one master John Franke, the registrar of the bishop of Lincoln, the common bell was rung again, and then all the commons in like manner with weapons, as they did before, ran again unto the house of one William Goldsmith, where the said registrar was alighted, and there they took all his books from him. And one John Taylor, of Louth, 'webstar,' brought out of the said house a great brand of fire, and by the commoners the said books were conveyed to the market-place."

The witness declares that he did his best to prevent this, but could not. "And then they by force carried this deponent under the high cross there, and said that he, with others to the number of six, being

there of the same opinion should look in the books to know what was in them." He commenced to read the king's commission in order to declare its meaning to the people, when the others, frightened by the noises of the mob, "' flang ' all the books down unto them beneath the cross, and then every man that was beneath got a piece of them and hurled them into the fire."

Whilst this scene was being enacted at the market cross, some of the crowd went and brought the registrar to the square, "and caused him, by a ladder, to climb up to the altitude of a half-part of the cross. And when he came up, he said unto this deponent, ' for the passion of Christ, priest, if canst, save my life. And as for the books that be already burnt, I pass not of them ' ; so as a little book of his reckoning of such money as he had laid out might be saved, and also the king's commission, which to be saved this deponent promised as much as in him was." Meantime the mob clamoured for the registrar to come down from the cross and burn his own books, which he was forced to do. The monk of Louth-park tried to save the small book of accounts, but as he was carrying it off "they all drew about him," he declares, "and demanded of him what book was that which he had in his hands." He told them that it was a book of reckonings. But they would not believe him, "and carried him with strength the breadth of the market-stead, unto a shop window of one Thomas Grantham, tailor, and then he read

unto them some parts of the contents of the book." At length they permitted him to keep the volume, but as he was carrying it to the registrar he was surrounded by three or four hundred people, who "took it out of his sleeve." He informed the king's officer of the loss, who, however, for his good service "paid for his dinner," and promised him "his letters of orders." In the afternoon the registrar was conveyed out of danger.

"Whilst this deponent," he continues, "was thus at dinner with the said registrar, the commons of the said town went unto the monastery of Legbourn, a mile and a half from Louth, and from thence they fetched and brought to Louth with them one Millicent and John Bellow, servants unto my lord privy seal, and put them in great fear and jeopardy of their lives." In the evening they put these two and one George Parker into prison.

Thus passed the first day of the rising. Early on the morning of the following day, Tuesday, the common bell at Louth was again set ringing. The king's commissioners were reported to be at Caistor, and Melton harangued the mob and gave order, that at the "next ringing of the bell" all should set out for that neighbouring town. Four priests and four laymen were appointed to speak with the commissioners, and of these "Dane William Borowby *alias* Moreland," the chief informant, was one. They were on foot till at Irford, a convent of Premonstratensian nuns, they "borrowed for this deponent, of the prioress there, a white trotting gelding, ready

bridled and saddled." On their way they were met by contingents from the neighbouring villages, and at Caistor hill they found about a thousand men, unarmed, waiting for them. Seeing the commissioners, Borowby, with some eighteen or twenty others, rode on to speak with them, "and with his cap in his hand desired them, in the name of the said company of commoners, to return and speak with them." This, most of them consented to do, and they were forced to take the oath to aid the commons. Lord Borough however, who was with the gentry when they were overtaken by the people, set spurs to his horse and escaped. The rioters thought that his servant Nicholas had aided him in his flight, and angry at not having secured him, they turned upon the servant. "And," continues the witness, "so great a number of them striking at him, as I never saw man escape such danger as he was in, having so many strokes and wounds as he had. And at last when he had fled evermore backward from them almost a quarter of a mile, saving himself always amongst the horsemen, he was stricken down by the footmen of Louth and Louth-Esk. And then, when he was stricken down they cried for a priest for him. And at last with much pain this deponent came unto him, and so at length he caused him to be conveyed unto the town and then confessed him, and sent two surgeons unto him from Louth."*

* The whole of the above narrative is taken from the depositions of Moreland, *alias* Borowby, the Louth-park monk. A. 2^o, pp. 91-129.

On the same day, Tuesday, October 3rd, the country round about Horncastle rose with even greater unanimity than at Louth. Some of the townsmen discovered that Dr. Raynes, the chancellor of the bishop of Lincoln, was still at Killingbroke, and unable to move from sickness. Upon this information they came thither "with a great company to take the chancellor, and did ring the common bell. And then the commons did cry, 'Kill him!' and would have drawn him out of his bed" had not they been dissuaded by others from violence.* The people of Killingbroke promised, however, to come to a great muster on Ancaster heath near to Horncastle, and thither they brought with them Dr. Raynes, the chancellor of Lincoln, "being very sick." The following day the gentry of the county were present, with the sheriff, Mr. Dymmoke, at their head, who "gave divers of the rebels, being poor men, money for their costs."

As the chancellor rode into the field with his captors the passions of the mob were stirred, and there occurred one of the two acts of violence, which alone in this or the subsequent Yorkshire rising, disgraced the movement.† "At his coming into the

* *Ibid.*, A. $\frac{2}{8}$, p. 3.

† Canon Dixon (Vol. i., p. 457 *note*) rightly says, "It (the 'Great Insurrection') was throughout more of a demonstration than a civil war, and with the exception of the murder of the chancellor and of a serving man, the behaviour of the so-called rebels was wonderfully temperate and orderly. On the other hand, the bloody perfidy of the strangely chosen hero of Mr. Froude comes out more conspicuously in his excited narrative than in any of the histories."

field," declares Brian Staines, "the rebels, whereof were many parsons and vicars, cried out with a loud voice, 'Kill him, kill him.' And upon that one William Hutchinson, of Horncastle, and William Balderstone, by the procurement of the said parsons and vicars, pulled him violently off his horse, kneeling upon his knees, and with their staves they slew him. And being dead, this deponent saith the priests continually crying, 'Kill him, kill him,' he also struck the said chancellor upon the arm with a staff."*

As the body of the murdered chancellor lay upon the ground in the midst of the mob, "his apparel

* Chapter House Bk., A. $\frac{2}{29}$, pp. 24-25. The deposition of this witness, Brian Staines, is the authority for supposing that the priests were the chief instigators of this crime. Mr. Froude accepts the statement without question, and exclaims: "These, we presume, were Pole's seven thousand children of light who had not bowed the knee to Baal—the noble army of saints who were to flock to Charles' banners." Canon Dixon (Vol. i., p. 457) has followed his guidance, and stated that the chancellor "was killed at the instigation of the clergy." The authority of the witness is, however, not altogether beyond suspicion. To judge from the depositions in this matter those implicated were generally ready to excuse themselves by casting the blame on others. In fact, Staines himself was accused of perpetrating the deed; and this seems to have been considered the true version. For in the notes which were intended to sum up the evidence, the following is entered: "Brian Staines was he which killed the chancellor" (*Ibid.*, A. $\frac{2}{28}$, p. 3). There is no reason to suppose, as would be natural from Mr. Froude's and Canon Dixon's narratives, that Dr. Mackarel, the abbot of Barlings, and "all his fraternity" were present at the murder of the chancellor; in fact, it appears that he was not with them till some days afterwards (*Ibid.*, A. $\frac{2}{29}$, p. 13), and knew nothing of the insurrection till the day after the murder.

was divided amongst them, and his purse brought to the sheriff, who afterwards distributed the money, that was in the same, to the poor men that were amongst the rebels." And the priests and vicars then advised them strongly to proceed on their journey, saying "they should lack neither gold nor silver." Banners were made and carried at the head of the detachments. A tenant of the abbot of Barlings "tied a white towel on the top of a banner and pinned a picture of the Trinity painted in parchment on the same towel, and caused his son to bear it."* And another, called Dymmoke's banner, was thus described by the man who carried it. "Item, the said Trotter saith the meaning of the plough borne in the banner was to encourage the husbandmen. The meaning of the chalice and the host was borne in remembrance that chalices, cross and jewels of the church would be taken away. The meaning of the five wounds was to 'courage' of the people to fight in Christ's cause. The meaning of the horn was borne in taking of horn cattle." †

Before, however, the assembly broke up at Horn-castle they devised certain articles of grievance which were to be forwarded to the king. They were drawn up by the gentry, including the sheriff Dymmoke and his brother, who held their discussion a mile or so from the body of the people, and were written out by

* *Ibid.*, A. 2^o, p. 7.

† *Ibid.*, p. 37. It was reported that the king was going to levy a tax on all cattle.

one of their number "on the field upon his saddle-bow." When finished Dymmoke and the rest rode up to the mob, and in a loud voice proclaimed the articles, saying: "Masters, ye see that in all the time we have been absent from you we have not been idle. How like you these articles? If they please you, say yea. If not, ye shall have them mended." And then the commons held up their hands, with a loud voice, saying: "We like them very well."*

The demands thus made to the king were six in number. They complained, (1) of the dissolution of the religious houses and of the consequent destitution of "the poorealty of the realm;" (2) of the restraints imposed on the distribution of property by the "statute of uses;" (3) of the grant to the king of the tenths and first-fruits of spiritual benefices; (4) of the payment of the subsidy demanded of them; (5) of the introduction into the king's council of Crumwell, Rich, and other "such personages as be of low birth and small reputation;" and (6) of the promotion of the archbishops of Canterbury and Dublin, and the bishops of Rochester, St. David's, and others, who, in their opinion, had clearly "subverted the faith of Christ."† These articles were

Ibid., A. 29, p. 31.

† Canon Dixon, Vol. i., p. 457, on the authority of Speed's account of the Lincolnshire articles, says that the insurgents acknowledged the king "to be by inheritance the supreme head of the Church of England." There is no indication of this as far as can be known. In the original depositions rather the opposite

dispatched at once to the king at Windsor, and Heneage, the royal commissioner, was allowed to accompany* the messenger.

Meantime the rest of the county was getting more disturbed. At Louth, where the insurrection first commenced, the people were still in arms. The monk of Louth-park deposes that on Wednesday morning (October 4th) he went "to hear mass at Louth church, and when mass was done there arose a common cry amongst the commons that the lord Borough (who had escaped from the insurgents the previous day) was coming with 1,500 men" against them. The people clamoured for the ringing of the alarm bell, "but this deponent got the bell rope three times to be cast up into the window, that it should not be rung," and it was only when the mob threatened to hang anyone that would prevent the ringing with the rope that he desisted. The report, however, proved groundless, and Moreland went to Horncastle for the "articles," which were drawn up the same day, and which he brought back with him. With five hundred others he went to try and fetch lord Hussey, and "lay at night at the bishop of Lincoln's castle of Sleaford." Lord Hussey had fled, but his lady sent them out provisions, "beer, bread, and saltfish." On the way Moreland admits

would appear, both in their case and that of the "Pilgrims of Grace," who subsequently adopted the same articles.

* "Perhaps to save him from being murdered by the priests!!" is Mr. Froude's remark on this permission accorded to Heneage.

that he for a short time wore "a sword and buckler," and for about five miles "did bare his javelin," and that some one lent him a "breastplate and sleeves of mail with a gorget," but declares that except for this he "never was armed."*

At Lincoln itself there had been a rising of the people also. The town was occupied by armed insurgents, and bishop Longland's palace had been broken into and sacked, the people doing there "as much hurt as they could."

For the first week the course of the insurgents was unchecked. They armed themselves as best they might, and did not hesitate to seize upon weapons and armour wherever they could be found.† They set beacons blazing and alarm bells ringing throughout the county, but the movement lacked a leader of ability, and it collapsed almost as suddenly as it had come into existence.

The messengers from the meeting at Horncastle were detained by the king for a short time, while preparations were hurried on to collect forces and forward munitions of war to the north. In a week from the first commencement of the movement Sir John Russell, with the advance guard, was at Stamford, and the duke of Suffolk, to whom the supreme

* Chapt. House Bk., A. 29, pp. 115-119.

† An interesting example of this may be given. "Philip Trotter, of Horncastle, is accused by Edward Dymmoke, saying he took the coat armour of Sir Lyon Dymmoke out of Horncastle church, where he was buried, and wore it upon his back."—*Ibid.*, A. 28, p. 13.

command had been given, was coming up in his rear.

On Wednesday, October 11th, just ten days after the outbreak, the king's herald arrived in Lincoln with the royal answer to the articles. It was couched in angry and vigorous language. "Concerning choosing of counsellors," the king wrote, "I never have read, heard nor known, that princes' counsellors and prelates should be appointed by rude and ignorant common people; nor that they were persons meet or of ability to discern and choose meet and sufficient counsellors for a prince. How presumptuous then are ye, the rude commons of one shire, and that one of the most brute and beastly of the whole realm and of least experience, to find fault with your prince for the electing of his counsellors and prelates, and to take upon you, contrary to God's law and man's law, to rule your prince whom ye are bound to obey and serve with both your lives, lands, and goods, and for no worldly cause to withstand.

"As to the suppression of houses and monasteries," they were granted to us by the parliament, "and not set forth by any counsellor or counsellors upon their mere will and fantasy, as you, full falsely, would persuade our realm to believe. And where ye alledge that the service of God is much thereby diminished, the truth thereof is contrary; for there are no houses suppressed where God was well served, but where most vice, mischief, and abomination of living was used: and that doth well appear by their

own confessions, subscribed with their own hands, in the time of our visitations.* And yet were suffered a great many of them, more than we by the act needed, to stand; wherein if they amend not their living, we fear we have more to answer for than for the suppression of all the rest. And as for their hospitality, for the relief of poor people, we wonder ye be not ashamed to affirm, that they have been a great relief to our people, when a great many, or the most part, hath not past 4 or 5 religious persons in them and divers but one, which spent the substance of the goods of their house in nourishing vice and abominable living. Now, what unkindness and unnaturality may we impute to you and all our subjects that be of that mind that had rather such an unthrifty sort of vicious persons should enjoy such possessions, profits and emoluments as grow of the said houses to the maintenance of their unthrifty life than we, your natural prince, sovereign lord and king, who doth and hath spent more in your defences of his own than six times they be worth."

The king's proclamation dismisses the "act of uses" as a subject which they cannot comprehend, and coming to speak of their demand to be relieved of the subsidy imposed upon them, he upbraids them for "so unkindly and untruly" dealing with him, who has done so much for them "without any cause or occasion."

* There is absolutely no record of any such confession.—*Vide* Vol. i., p. 348.

Lastly, as to the "*First-fruits*," Henry declared that the people ought to be glad for him to have them, to enable him to bear "the great and excessive charges for the maintenance" of the commonwealth. "Wherefore," he concludes, "we charge you, eftsoon, upon the foresaid bonds and pains, that ye withdraw yourselves to your own houses, every man; and no more to assemble, contrary to the laws and your allegiances; and to cause the provokers of you to this mischief to be delivered to our lieutenant's hands or ours, and you yourselves to submit to such condign punishment as we and our nobles shall think you worthy."*

On Thursday, October 12, the people were ordered to be at the Castle-garth, in Lincoln, to hear the king's answer to their petition. Difficulties had by this time arisen between the gentlemen and the common people. They mutually distrusted each other, and at the reading of the royal letter the dissensions became apparent. "We the gentlemen," says one of them, when the letters came, thought "to read them secretly among ourselves, but as we were reading them the commons present cried that they would hear them read or else pull them from us. And, therefore, I read the letters openly; and because there was a little clause there, which we feared would stir the commons, I did leave that clause unread, which was perceived by a canon there,

* State Papers, i., p. 463.

and he said openly the letter was falsely read, by reason whereof I was like to be slain."*

From that hour agreement was impossible, and on the following morning, Friday, October 13, the Lincolnshire resistance to Henry's measures was at an end. The gentry went forward to Stamford to meet the duke of Suffolk, and in their company he, with Russell and Richard Crumwell, rode through Lincoln, the streets of which were crowded with a sullen and disheartened populace. The sixty thousand insurgents disbanded without a single blow. On that same day, Friday, October 13, the royal proclamation was read at the cross in the market place at Louth, and by Sunday, Henry had received at Windsor the news of the complete collapse, of what threatened to be a formidable popular protest against his policy and government.

On the same Sunday, Wriothesley wrote to Crumwell:—"There arrived, also, letters from my lord of Suffolk, declaring all to be well there, and that the town of Louth is come in to the number of 200, and are not only sworn, but have also presented to my lord lieutenant (the earl of Shrewsbury) 15 persons, the names hereof I send unto your lordship herewith, which were the great doers of this matter amongst them, who are in ward; holy doctor Mackarel, captain Cobler, Manby, and the rest of all the said number." He concludes by saying that the king, to meet the expenses of suppressing the rising,

* "Confession of Thomas Mayne," quoted by Froude, iii., p. 117.

“willed me to require you to tax the fat priests thereabouts; naming doctor Wolman (dean of Wells); doctor Bell (bishop of Worcester); doctor Knight (afterwards bishop of Bath and Wells), and others about ‘Poules’ or elsewhere.” He also adds that the dean of St. Stephen’s, doctor John Chambers, had already given 200 marks, and doctor Lupton, the provost of Eton, £100, “which his highness also requireth you to lay to them for a precedent.”*

The king saw at once how prejudicial to his position abroad was this overt expression of popular dissatisfaction with his domestic policy. He did not even wait for the news of the suppression of the rising, but on October 13th, even before Suffolk had entered Lincoln, he had written to his ambassadors at the court of France, bishop Gardiner and Sir John Wallop, to counteract any evil which might arise from the news of the rebellion. “You shall understand,” he says, “that, by the blowing abroad of certain false tales—that is to say, that we should intend to take all the ornaments, plate, and jewels of all the parish churches within our realm into our hands and convert the same totally to our own use; and that we should also therewith intend to tax all our commons, as the like thereof was never heard of, in any Christian

* State Papers, i., p. 471. Chapter House Book, A. 2²8, pp. 319-326, contains a list of the sums of money contributed by various prelates and others for this purpose. Amongst others may be noted: “The abbot of Reading, £100,” and “the abbot of Glastonbury, £100.”

religion, when we assure you there was never word spoken, or thing thought, by us or any of our council touching such matters; which certain traitors (whereof two be already executed, and we have more of the authors ready to suffer like punishment) devised and invented, being they otherwise in the danger of our laws, and thinking, in this tombeling to fly and escape—certain of our subjects, with a number of boys and beggars, assembled themselves together in our county of Lincoln. And for as much as the matter of this insurrection may be there noted a greater thing than it is and so spoken to our dishonour, we thought meet to advertise you, as of the cause and the state of the thing we have done already." He concludes by saying that Suffolk, "who is now there, with a great force," will, without doubt, "give the traitors the reward of their traitorous attempt very shortly." And he adds that in six days he has "levied and conveyed" to Amphill "an army of" 80,000 tried men, which he hopes his ambassadors "may declare it" to the king of France, "and to all others whatsoever shall be bruited of the same, and that we can at all times return every man home again to his house or dwelling place, in as short space, without tumult or any manner of inconvenience."*

* Tierney's "Dodd," Vol. i., App. xlii., "from the original, in my possession." No such army as the king speaks of was in existence. Eleven days later the privy council ask the duke of Norfolk's advice whether it was "expedient that his grace should levy an army." (Hardwicke State Papers, i., p. 26.)

Upon the submission of the men of Lincolnshire, Henry issued another proclamation giving them his pardon and extolling his own generosity in so doing. They were ordered to "leave all their harness and all other weapons in the market place of our city of Lincoln," and to depart peacefully to their homes. "And if," the document concludes, "you will not take this most gracious and merciful clemency, at this present time, but continue one whole day longer after the receipt hereof, we shall execute all extremity against you, your wives and children without mercy; to the most terrible and fearful example of all others, whilst the world shall endure hereafter."*

It is well to enter more in detail into the part taken by the monks in the insurrection. It is evident that they must have given a movement which was initiated in their defence their best wishes, but beyond this and the fact that they had given food, and perhaps money, to the mob, and that some few were violently compelled to go with it, there is nothing that can be construed into a proof of complicity. The first with whose name the Lincolnshire rising is especially associated is Dr. Mackarel, abbot of Barlings.† He and his brethren, who were of the Premonstratensian order, are accused not only of taking an active part in

* State Papers, i., p. 468.

† He was titular bishop of Chalcedon and suffragan of Lincoln. As chosen agent of so prudent and experienced a prelate as Longland in the administration of his diocese, it is to be presumed he was not naturally of the temper of a brawler, or disposed to rush to the head of a rabble.

fomenting the disturbance ; but the abbot is made the head of the rising, and as Mr. Froude's account (which has found a place in most histories) has it : —“ Dr. Mackarel, the abbot of Barlings, was present in full armour.” The depositions of witnesses after the insurrection give a different picture. One of the prisoners, asked “ of whom the said traitors had relief in money, victuals, or harness,” replied that “ he *heard say* that the said traitors had money of the abbots of Barling and Bardney.”* Another, speaking of the Yorkshire rising, declared that letters were received from Lincolnshire speaking “ of the great present of the abbot of Barlings with his comfortable words, that any man counted themselves half ashamed to be so far behind them.”† In the official notes as to the evidence it is said :—“ The abbot of Barlings with divers of his canons or monks be accused by Edward Dymmoke, Thomas Dymmoke, Esquires, Robert Dighton, and George Staines, gentlemen, saying : that the said abbot and his monks or canons were among the commons in harness and brought them victuals and said unto them they should lack none such as they had, and, further, they say that the said abbot did divers times move them to go forward.” To this is appended the note :—“ Mem. The abbot moved them divers times to go forward.”‡

In his own examination, taken in the Tower of

* Chapter House Book, A. 2^o/₈, p. 116.

† *Ibid.*, p. 154.

‡ *Ibid.*, p. 1.

London on January 12th, 1537, abbot Maekarel declares that:—"By command of Mr. Dymmocke, the sheriff, he brought a cart load of victuals to the rebels. And at his coming amongst them for fear of his life and for safeguard of his house, and to the intent they should not spoil his said household he said to the sheriff these words, or like in effect, following:—"Mr. Sheriff, I beseech you to be good master unto me and save my house from spoiling and I will help you with such victual and goods as I have.'" Further, after declaring that he knew nothing about the insurrection till the Wednesday (October 4th), and explaining what he considered to be the causes which led to the rising, he asserts that the sheriff Willoughby, "with great bragging and menacing words commanded him to bring victuals," and denies utterly that "he did at any time persuade the people by sermon or oration or any kind of persuasion."

"Item," the record runs, "he saith that upon Friday after the commencement of the insurrection (October 6th) when he had sure knowledge that the rebels would come into his monastery—and at that time there were in his house a hundred of the same rebels—he then weeping declared to his brethren and some of his servants these words, or like in effect following: 'Brethren and servants, I perceive that these rebels will have both you and me with them and what shall become of us God knoweth, but this ye shall understand that their cause is nought

and surely God and man must of justice take vengeance on them.'

'Item he saith, that he would have fled at the beginning of the insurrection, saving he feared the burning of his house and the utter destruction of the same and spoiling of all his goods.'

"Be it remembered," continues the document, "that a canon of the abbot of Barlings, now prisoner in the Tower of London, being examined what words the said abbot had to his canons, servants and the rebels, at their being in his house as is aforesaid, declared that the abbot being by them required to send his canons to the rest of their company, answered, it was against the laws of God and man that any religious person should go to battle and specially against their prince. And said further, that the said abbot was so sorrowful that he could not, in a great while after their departure from his house, say any part of his divine service for weeping."*

In a subsequent examination on March 23rd, 1537, before, Legh, Layton and Ap Rice, abbot Mackarel made certain admissions about the way in which he viewed the work of suppression. He says that when they were prisoners in Lincoln gaol the cellarer was admitted to bail by Sir William Parr in order that he might collect the rents due to the abbey, and of these Sir William got £20. He also confessed that "he was in much fear of deprivation (at the) time of the king's late visitation. And the

* Chapt. House Bk., A. 2^o, pp. 11-13.

visitor Mr. Bedyll came so suddenly on him that he had no leisure or deliberation to tell the money, which he delivered in a purse to 'one Thomas Osegarby.' Also he says," continues the record, "that when Freeman and Wiseman, the king's surveyors, were suppressing the lesser abbeys in Lincolnshire, the report was common, that they should return to resolve the greater, and he then gathered his brethren together and said to them thus:— 'Brethren, ye hear how other religious men be treated and how they have but forty shillings given to each of them and so let go; but they that have played the wise men among them have provided beforehand for themselves and sold away divers things, wherewith they may help themselves hereafter. And ye hear also this rumour that goeth abroad as well as I, namely, how that the greater abbeys should go down also. Wherefore by your advice, this shall be my counsel, that we do take such plate as we have and certain of the best vestments and set them aside and sell them if need be, and divide the money coming thereof among us, when the house is first suppressed. And I promise you, on my faith and conscience, ye shall have your part thereof and of every penny that I have during my life. And thereupon the said brethren agreed thereto.' Upon this, concludes the abbot, I sent plate worth £100 and some of the best vestments to one 'Thomas Bruer.' " *

* B. Mus. Cleop., E. iv., f. 245.

The only other witness against the abbot of Barlings was one Bernard Fletcher. He deposed "that the rebels being within a flight shot of the said abbot's pastures the same abbot brought them 80 wethers, 6 oxen, and a wain laden with bread and drink." Further on in his examination he declared that when the abbot "brought his said victual to the rebels, he there openly declared unto them these words, or like in effect following: 'Masters I have brought you here certain victuals. Go forward and stick to this matter. I have a lordship at Sweton and I will prepare for you as much more victual and bring the same to you to Ancaster heath.'"

But "be it remembered," runs the record, "that after the examination of this deponent named Bernard Fletcher, the same deponent and the abbot of Barlings were brought face to face. And there the abbot denied utterly that he brought any sheep to the rebels, and further said that there came no sheep in his company. Whereupon this deponent being asked the question whether he did or no, saith that he cannot perfectly tell whether the 80 sheep expressed in his examination were the same abbot's or no, or to whom they did belong or appertain."

"The same abbot also denieth that he said to the said rebels at his repair to them: 'Go forward and stick to this matter, etc.' . . . But saith that, being amazed and fearing lest they would have killed him forasmuch as a great many of them were his mortal enemies said unto them: 'Masters I have according

to your commandment brought you victuals beseeching you to be good unto me and preserve my house from spoil. And if ye will let me have a passport, I will go to a lordship of mine called Sweton, where against your coming to Ancaster heath I will prepare for you as much more victual.' And the same abbot being asked why he spake these words, said he intended if he might have had his passport to have stolen from them clean and gone his way, for without he should use such policy it was not possible."*

In a previous "confession," made at Lincoln shortly after the rising, abbot Mackarel had said that "a great number of persons had forcibly entered the house and slept in the chambers and on the 'hay-mowes.' When commanded to come with the insurgents, he had said that he and 'his brethren would come and sing the litany, leaving them to do as they pleased.' He told them that 'it was contrary to their vow to wear harness,' but the two chieftains swore they should, whereupon he turned to the altar to hear mass, trembling so that he could 'hardly say his service.' Reports, he says, came that a body of the insurgents were coming 'to fire the monastery,' and being commanded 'in the name of the great captain' to come with his brethren, he brought them 'beer, bread, cheese and six bullocks.' He then asked to return home, which was permitted, but 'six of his brethren' were forced to remain with the host 'seeing they were tall men.' "†

* *Ibid.*, pp. 19-22.

† *Calendar*, xi., No. 805.

The depositions of Thomas Bradley, sub-prior of Barlings, and other canons of the house agree with their abbot's in the main facts. Compelled by the insurgents, six of the brethren appear to have borne arms for some days and gone along with the host. From the evidence, it certainly does not appear that the abbot and all his canons "rode at the head of the host in full armour," or that he and one of his brethren were justly executed for having "been concerned in the murder of the chancellor."*

As to Bardney and Kirksted, the evidence is more meagre. Seven monks of the first monastery were examined in November and confessed that four or five of their number went for a short time with the rebels, "by command of William Wright."† Some other witnesses confessed having seen them in the ranks, and one "heard say that the said traitors" had help from the abbey.‡

The Kirksted monks acknowledged their part in the rising when questioned. Under threats, that "if they came not forth to the host (they) should be (burnt in) their own house" . . . about four o'clock in the evening, the abbot, cellarer, bursar and all the monks able to go, 17 in all, went to the outer gate, where they met a servant of the abbey, who told them they could wait till the next day. At eleven o'clock the following morning all except the abbot departed, "the cellarer and bursar horsed and

* Froude, iii., p. 212.

† Calendar, xi., 828.

‡ Chapt. House Bk., A. $\frac{2}{20}$, p. 116.

with battle axes, the rest unhorsed." Two days before, a band of 60 of the insurgents had carried away all the servants of the abbey to the muster. The abbot "as being sick" was excused, but he gave the bursar 20s. and a horse laden with victual. The day upon which the monks arrived at the headquarters of the insurgents two of them returned home sick, four went the following day (Friday), and four more on Saturday; the rest remained "till Tuesday morning." As for the abbot, he "was glad of their return, and thanked God there was no business."*

The punishment meted out to the insurgents was terrible. About a hundred are said to have been carried away to London, and lodged in the Tower. In the spring of the following year they were tried, on Tuesday, in the third week of Lent, March 6th, by Sir William Parr and a special commission sitting at Lincoln. The jury was apparently in their favour. Thomas Moigne, a gentleman of the county and one of the accused, spoke skilfully for a long time in their behalf, and "but for the diligence of the king's serjeant" they would have been acquitted. As it was they were condemned, although sixty-three were immediately respited. The other three and thirty, including the abbot of Kirksted and three of his monks, six monks of Bardney, four canons of Barlings, and seven secular priests, were ordered for immediate execution.

* Calendar, xi., 828.

Towards the end of March the abbot of Barlings, William Moreland, monk of Louth-park, Thomas Kendal, vicar of Louth, with two other priests and twelve laymen, were tried in London before chancellor Audeley, found guilty, and condemned to death.

CHAPTER III.

THE PILGRIMAGE OF GRACE.

THE sudden termination of the Lincolnshire rising did not by any means relieve Henry from his domestic difficulties. Popular protests against his policy and active interference with his agents in carrying out his orders were not confined to the fen district and its neighbourhood. "Alarming reports came in of the temper of the north-midland and eastern counties. The disposition of the people between Lincoln and London was said to be as bad as possible." A servant of Sir William Hussey reported, that "in every place by the way as his master and he came, he hath heard as well old people as young pray God speed the rebellious persons in Lincolnshire, and wish themselves with them, saying that if they came that way that they shall lack nothing that they can help them unto. And the said Hugh (the servant) being asked what persons they were which so reported," replied "*all.*"* Another witness declared that "he heard some say in the south parts (as he rode towards London,

* Sir W. Fitzwilliam to Crumwell, quoted by Froude iii., p. 112.

between Stamford and London) that the commons of those parts were in one mind with 'the northerners,' and wished they had come forward an end, for then they should have had more to take their parts." And also when in London, a shopman said to him: "Because you, a northern man you shall pay but sixpence for your shoes, for ye have done very well of late, and would to God you had come an end, for we were in the same mind that you were."* But the inquisitorial severity of the king and his advisers visited with the extremity of punishment even the slightest approval of the popular movement. The English terror had now fully set in. "The ninth of October," writes Stowe, "a priest and a butcher were hanged at Windsor, by martial law, for words spoken in the behalf of the Lincolnshire men. The butcher wished the good fellows (as he termed them) in Lincolnshire to have the flesh on his stall rather than to sell it at such a price as he was offered. The priest standing by likewise wished them to have it, for he said they had need of it. Also James Mallet, doctor of law, late chaplain to queen Catherine, for like words was executed at Chelmsford." †

Simultaneously with the movement in Lincolnshire the king experienced opposition to his schemes of

* Chapter House Bk., A. 2^o, p. 66.

† Stowe, ed. 1615, p. 572. Hall places this circumstance in the Yorkshire rising. Wriothesley, however, gives the date "9th October." The nephew of the imperial ambassador (Calendar, xi., 714) refers to the fact, but calls the man "a shoemaker."

suppression in Cheshire, which but for the prompt action of Sir Piers Dutton, the sheriff, might have proved serious. The abbey of Norton, in that county, did not come strictly within the act for suppressing monasteries under £200 a-year; its income having been returned at £258 11s. 8d. Still, as early as August, 1536, it had by some means or other fallen into the king's power. On the third of that month Sir Piers informed Crumwell that he had "taken the bodies of the abbot of Norton, Robert Jamyns and the stranger, a cunning smith, two of the said abbot's servants, also Randal Brereton,* baron of the king's exchequer of Chester, and John Hall, of Chester, merchant, and have them in my custody and keeping." † Shortly after Anne Boleyn's disgrace, the bishop of Salisbury had interceded with Crumwell for "the poor abbot of Norton" and the religious of "that house, for the poor people" of that neighbourhood were much "refreshed there." ‡ But by October the abbey was in the hands of the king's receiver, John Byrkhed, who in his Michaelmas account acknowledges that he has received nearly £350 from the rents and sales of the abbey moveables, and has already remitted about £100 to the king. The greater part of the rest had been

* Brereton is supposed to have been uncle to Sir William Brereton, who had been beheaded in May preceding for his alleged connection with Anne Boleyn. Ormerod's "Cheshire," i., p. 502, *note*.

† Wright, p. 52.

‡ Calendar x., 942.

given to Thomas Byrkhed, the then called abbot, to keep up the house till the final dissolution.*

By this time Robert Hall, the true abbot, had been released or had escaped from prison, and apparently arrived at his monastery as the royal commissioners were packing up the valuables previous to removing them. "Pleaseth your good lordship," writes Dutton to Crumwell on October 12th, "to be advertised that Mr. Combes and Mr. Balles, the king's commissioners within the county of Chester, were lately at Norton, within the county of Chester, for the suppressing of the abbey there. And when they had packed up such jewels and stuff as they had there, and thought upon the morrow after to depart thence, the abbot gathered a great company together to the number of two or three hundred persons, so that the said commissioners were in fear of their lives, and were fain to take (to) a tower there, and thereupon send a letter to me ascertaining me what danger they were in, and desired me to come and assist them or else they were never like to come thence.

"Which letter came to me about 9 o'clock in the night upon Sunday last (October 8th), and about two o'clock in the same night I came thither with

* Exch. Aug. Off. Mins. Accts., 27-28 Hen. VIII., 80, M. 3. It would hence appear that a relation of the receiver Byrkhed had been appointed to the office of abbot. Robert Hall was the last regular abbot ("Monasticon," vi., p. 313); Thomas Byrkhed received a pension of £24 (Aug. Office Misc. Bk., 249, f. 22), while the real abbot was condemned to death, as will be seen.

such of my lovers and tenants as I had near about me, and found divers fires made as well within the gates as without. And the said abbot had caused an ox and other victuals to be killed and prepared for such of his company as he had then there. And it was thought on the morrow after he had comfort to have had a great number more.

“Notwithstanding, I used some policy, and came suddenly upon them, so that the company that were there fled. And some of them took to poles and the waters, and it was so dark that I could not find them. And it was thought if the matter had not been quickly handled it would have grown to further inconvenience, to what danger God knoweth.

“Howbeit, I took the abbot and three of his canons, and brought them to the king’s castle of Halton, and there committed them to ward to the constable, to be kept as the king’s rebels upon pain of £1,000, and afterwards saw the same commissioners and their stuff conveyed thence, and William Parker, the king’s servant, who is appointed to be the king’s farmer there, restored to his possession.”*

On receipt of this letter Henry sent to thank Sir Piers Dutton for his great service. In reply to the sheriff’s implied question as to the punishment of the abbot and his three canons, the king wrote: “For answer whereunto ye shall understand that for as much as it appeareth that the said late abbot and canons have most traitorously used themselves

* “Ellis Orig. Letters,” 3rd Series, iii., p. 42.

against us and our realm, our pleasure and commandment is, that if this shall fully appear to you to be true that then you shall immediately upon the sight hereof without any manner further delay cause them to be hanged as most arrant traitors in such sundry places as you shall think requisite, for the terrible example of all others hereafter. And herein fail ye not . . . travail with such dexterity as this matter may be finished with all possible diligence."*

The execution was not carried out immediately, because, as Dutton explains a month later (30th November), before he had time to do so he learnt from the earl of Derby of the conclusion of the Pilgrimage of Grace, and concluded to wait till the king's "further pleasure were made known." He tells Crumwell that he writes for instructions, as his fellow commissioner, Sir William Brereton, refuses to follow this course, and he adds that he has "the said evildoers and offenders in straight endurance of imprisonment within his castle of Chester, there surely to be kept to abide his grace's pleasure."† The final fate of the abbot and his companions, like that of so many others at this time, remains uncertain, but no record appears of their pardon.

The most formidable opposition which Henry experienced at this time was without doubt the popular movement known as the "pilgrimage of grace." In

* Ormerod's "Cheshire," i., p. 502.

† *Ibid.*

the numbers who joined the agitation, in the high position of their leaders, and in the extent of the disaffection, the king and his counsellors had reason for the utmost alarm, as they felt the southern population could not be relied upon for support of a policy which they detested; and from over the seas were floating rumours of foreign combinations to aid the English people to strike for the rights of church, their ancient faith, and their own temporal good. In five counties, from the borders of Scotland to the Lune and the Humber, the agitation remained for a short time unchecked.

As in Lincolnshire, so in the more northerly parts the effect of the late act of suppression had been patent to all. In Yorkshire, with the archdeaconry of Richmond and the bishopric of Durham, including the cells of larger monasteries some 47 houses of men and 23 convents of women came within the pecuniary limit for dissolution, and a yearly income of £4,384 8s. 8d. had been transferred from the district to the king's purse.* By the feast of St. Michael of this year, 1536, Hugh Fuller, the royal receiver for the county of Yorkshire, reported that he had gathered in for the king's use from the half-yearly rents, the sales of goods, and the estimated value of plate, bells, and lead, above £4,500. Five hundred and three ounces of gilt plate, 657 ounces of parcel gilt, and 321 ounces of silver—in all 1,481 ounces of plate, valued at

* *Vide* list, Calendar, x., No. 1233.

£224 7s. 6d.—had besides been forwarded to Henry's treasure house, and 133 fadders of lead, worth £440, with 37 bells, valued at an average of £3 each, the spoils from the church roofs and belfries of the district, were stored up for sale.*

That the people were stirred most deeply by the sales of monastic effects and by the fear of even more extensive desecration of consecrated churches and seizure of ecclesiastical property does not admit of doubt. The causes which led to the armed protest were fully and boldly declared by the leader of the movement, Robert Aske, when before Pomfret castle he wrote to the lords who held it urging them to deliver up their charge and join the popular movement. "And in the same letter the said Aske rehearsed how the said commons were gnawn in the

* Exch. Aug. Off. Mins. Accts., 27-28 Hen. VIII., No. 178, mm. 5d. 18d. One or two instances of hardships in particular monasteries and convents of this district have been already referred to. We may here add a few more. One monastery, *Warter*, which supported a prior and 12 canons, with 50 dependents and boys, was sold with all its goods to the earl of Rutland for £800 (*Ibid.*, 178, m. 5). At *Nunburnholme*, a small convent, there were 12 dependents and "many poor living there" (*Ibid.*, m. 15). At *Molsby*, a convent of eight nuns, a certain Elizabeth Ward had received a corrody, and on August 4th when the nuns were dismissed, in consideration of £3 6s. 8d. paid by the commissioners, she renounced all further right. She was "*impotens et surda*," and in consideration of her debility and poverty the commissioners gave the sum to a man of trust, who promised to keep the poor lady during her life (*Ibid.*, m. 15). At *Drax* there were 39 "dependents and boys" besides other poor people (*Ibid.*, 14d.). At *Ferriby* 34 servants with boys and poor supported in the house (*Ibid.*, m. 15).

conscience with spreading of heretics, suppression of houses of religion and other matters touching the commonwealth." In his subsequent interview he "declared to the said lords, as well spiritual as temporal, the griefs of the commons. And how first, that the lords spiritual had not done their duties in that they had not been plain with the king's highness for the speedy remedy and quenching of the said heretics and the preachers thereof and for the suffering of the same ; and for the ornaments of the churches and abbeyes suppressed and the violating of relics by the suppressors, with the irreverent ✓demeanour of the doers thereof, with abuse of the visitors and their impositions taken extraordinary and other their negligences in not doing their duty as well to their sovereign as to the commons. And to the lords temporal the said Aske declared they had misused themselves in that they likewise had not so providently ordered and declared to his said highness the poverty of his realm and that part specially ; in so much as in the north parts much of the relief of the commons was by succour of the abbeyes, and before the last statute thereof made, the king's highness had no money out of that shire in a manner yearly, for his grace's revenues there yearly went to the finding of Berwick, that now the profits of abbeyes suppressed, tenths and first-fruits went out of those parts." By reason of this "within short space of years there should be no money nor treasure in those parts ; neither the

tenant to have to pay his rents to his lord, nor the lord to have money to do the king's service withal. For as much as in those parts there was neither the presence of his grace's execution of his laws, nor yet but little recourse of merchandise, so that of necessity the said country should either perish with the Scots, or for very poverty be enforced to make commotions or rebellions."*

At the close of this narrative to the king, Aske again insists upon the same points. "In all parts of the realm," he says, "men's hearts much grudged with the suppression of abbeys, and the first-fruits, by reason the same would be the destruction of the whole religion in England. And their especial great grudge is against the lord Crumwell, being reputed the destroyer of the commonwealth, as well amongst most part of the lords as all other the worshipful commons. And surely, if he continue in favour and presence with your grace it will danger the occasion of new commotions which will be very dangerous to your grace's person; for as far as the said Aske can perceive there is no earthly man so evil believed as the said lord Crumwell is with the commoners. . . . And also the said Aske saith that the most part of all the realm greatly impugne against certain bishops of the new learning reputed them and their folks as heretics and the great causes of this late commotion: and also

* Chapt. House Bk., A. 2^o, p. 53. Aske's narrative to the king.

against the lord chancellor for so general granting of injunctions and for playing of '*ambi-dexter*' in granting and dissolving of injunctions."*

But if the popular leader was bold in his declaration to the king, he is more explicit still as to the nature of the popular desires when examined in the Tower. Asked as to whether he considered that false reports "were not one of the greatest causes of the" insurrection,† he replies "that he thinks those bruits were one of the greatest causes, but the suppression of abbeys was the greatest cause of the said insurrection which the hearts of the commons most grudged at." And further he adds "that he thinks that only the suppression of the abbeys and 'dimission' of preachers had caused an insurrection though the said bruits had not been spoken of at all."‡

Another fragment of his examination goes more particularly into the reasons which actuated the people in this movement. "To the 23rd article," runs this record, "the said Aske saith: First, to the statute of suppressions, he did grudge against the same and so did all the whole country, because the abbeys in the north parts gave great alms to poor men and laudably served God. In which parts of late days they had but small comfort by ghostly teaching; and by occasion of the said suppression

* *Ibid.*, p. 64.

† *Ibid.*, p. 87. "Interrogatories" signed by "T. Crumwell."

‡ *Ibid.*, A. 25, pp. 198-199.

the divine service of Almighty God is much diminished, great number of masses unsaid, and the blessed consecration of the Sacrament now not used and showed in those places, to the distress of the faith and spiritual comfort to man's soul. The temple of God (is now) razed and pulled down, the ornaments and relics of the church of God un-reverently used ; the tombs and sepulchres of honourable and noble men pulled down and sold. No hospitality (is) now, in those places, kept, but the farmers for the most part let and tavern* out the farms of the same houses to other farmers for lucre and advantage to themselves. And the profits of these abbeys yearly go out of the country to the king's highness so that in short space little money, by occasion of the said yearly rents, tenths and first-fruits, should be left in the said country, in consideration of the absence of the king's highness in those parts, want of his laws and the frequentation of merchandise.

“ Also divers and many of the said abbeys were in the mountains and desert places where the people are rude of condition and not well taught of the law of God. And when the said abbeys stood the said people not only had worldly refreshing in their beds, but also spiritual refuge both by the ghostly living of them, and also by spiritual information and preaching. And many their tenants whether feod† servants to them or serving men (were) well

* “ Underlet.”

† *I.e.*, holding leases.

succoured by abbeys. And now not only these tenants and servants want refreshing there both of meat, cloth, and wages, and know not now where to have any living, but also strangers and baggers of corn (who) betwixt Yorkshire, Lancashire, Kendal, and Westmoreland, and the bishoprick (were) greatly helped both horse and men by the said abbeys; for never was in these parts denied either horsemeat or man's meat, so that the people were greatly refreshed by the said abbeys, where now they have no such succour. Wherefore the said statute of suppression was greatly to the decay of the commonwealth of that country; and all its parts of all degrees greatly grudged against the same, and yet doth, their duty of allegiance always saved.

“Also the abbeys were one of the beauties of this realm to all men and strangers passing through the same. Also all gentlemen (were) much succoured in their needs, with many their young sons there assisted, and in nunneries their daughters brought up in virtue, and also their evidences (*i.e.*, title deeds) and money left to the use of infants in abbeys' hands—always sure there.* And such abbeys as were near the danger of sea banks, were

* As examples see the wills in “*Testamenta Eboracensia*,” Vol. iii., pp. 203-205; Vol. v., pp. 189-191, 222; in “*Archæological Journal*,” Vol. xxv., p. 72, see the provision of Sir John Stanley, on his becoming a monk of Westminster, whereby his young son and heir is to be brought up until twelve years old by the abbess of Barking, and from that age until manhood under the care and guardianship of the abbot of Westminster.

great maintainers of sea walls and dykes, maintainers and builders of bridges and highways (and) such other things for the commonwealth."*

Aske then goes on to state his reasons for objecting to the statute by which the princess Mary was declared illegitimate. "Also it was thought," he concludes, "that the divorce made by the bishop of Canterbury, hearing that appeal, was not lawful. Yea! and then men doubted the authority of his consecration, having not his pall as his predecessor had."

Passing on to speak of the statute of "first-fruits," Aske calls attention to the way in which houses still standing were hampered by the new legislation; "it was thought good that the statute should be annulled because it would be the destruction of the state of religion, which was and is profitable for the commonwealth both in soul and body, as before rehearsed. For it may chance so that in some year by death, deprivation or resignation the king's highness may be entitled thereunto two or three times, or more. And for the pain of the same, worshipful men and friends must be bound, and so they to be in danger and the house not able to pay the same. For now, in manner, what with the king's money granted by them and the tenths yearly by them paid, all or most part of their plate is gone and cattle also and their houses in debt. So that, either they must minish their household and hospi-

* *Ibid.*, pp. 209, 210.

tality and, enforced, keep fewer monks than their foundation; or else surrender their abbeyes into the king's hands as forced (to do) for need, and the money thereof always coming out of that country to the great detriment of the commonwealth there. Whereby all the riches and treasures of religion was and is esteemed the king's treasure, as ready at his commandment. Also because they had plenty of riches they adorned the temple of God and always succoured their neighbour in their need with part of the same—their money for the most part current amongst their people. Also it was then thought firmly that, by the law of God, the king's highness ought not to have the first-fruits of religion, for never king of England had it before, nor now none other. On what could the brethren live when the first year's rents are gone during that year? Also it was said it was not granted at York, by convocation, nor agreed unto. Wherefore it was then thought good this statute to be annulled, or otherwise qualified for these reasons and many more.”*

When questioned about the statutes of the “royal supremacy” and “that words should be treason,” Aske replied, “that then all men much murmured at the same and said it could not stand with God's law. And divers reasons thereof (were) made, whereof he delivered one to the archbishop of York in Latin, containing a whole sheet of paper or more But the great bruit in all men's mouths then was, that

* *Ibid.*, p. 211.

never king of England since the faith came within the same realm claimed any such authority. And it would be found to be an increase of a division from the unity of the Catholic Church, if men might without fear, and by the king's favour declare their learning without his grace's displeasure."

With regard to the "statute of words that be treason," he declared that except in relation to the supremacy question "he heard few men grudge thereat." But on that matter "every man is fearful to show his learning or to labour for the same intent to show their learning, because there is a temporal law whereby they should incur the danger, or else the displeasure of their prince. And if the cause touch the health of man's soul, then it were a gracious deed that the king's highness would annul that statute and that learned men in divinity might show their learning either in convocation or preaching."*

Examined as to the popular opinion about the bishops and the griefs of the commons on that score, Aske said that they declared them to be heretics, "because they were so noted in the petitions of Lincolnshire and because they were reputed to be of the new learning and (holding) many tenets of Luther and Tyndal. And to the bishop of Worcester (Latimer), because it was said, either he was before abjured or else should have borne a faggot for his preaching. And that the archbishop of

* *Ibid.*, p. 215.

Canterbury was the first that ever was archbishop of that see that had not his pall from a spiritual man or from the see of Rome. And because he took upon him to make the divorce betwixt the king's highness and the lady Catherine dowager, where it was appealed to the Church, and for other his opinions, which the said Aske much noted, not because they were so openly bruited with all men. And as to the other two bishops,* surely they be marvellously evil spoken of, to be maintainers of the new learning and preachers of the same; and that because of their information religion was not favoured and the statute of suppression taken place, for they preached as it was said against the benefit of habits in religion and such like, and against the common orders and rules before used in the universal Church. This was the common voice of all men." . . . And also "because they varied from the old usages and sermons of the Church and because they preached contrary to the same, therefore they were bruited so to be schismatics." †

As Aske the leader thought, so thought the rest who followed him. Lord Darcy, speaking to him of the supremacy question, assured him "he had in the parliament chamber declared before the lords his whole mind touching any matter there to be argued touching their faith." ‡ At another time the same

* Rochester and Dublin.

† *Ibid.*, pp. 227-228.

‡ *Ibid.*, p. 233. Lord Darcy's account of the method followed in parliament is of interest. "Before this last parliament," he said,

lord in regard to the preaching of the new bishops said "that he would be no heretic."* Others deposed that they demanded the deprivation of the bishops "because they were supposed to be occasion of the breach of the unity of the Church."

Thus in the "Pilgrimage of Grace" the causes of the armed resistance to the royal policy appear to have been chiefly ecclesiastical. The suppression of the abbeys was felt to be a blow to religion in those parts no less than a hardship to the poor, and a detriment to the country at large. The royal supremacy was looked upon as founded only on Henry's whim and as a pretension without precedent in history, while the renunciation of papal authority was held to be subversive of the principle of unity in the Christian Church, and the first step towards diversity of doctrine and practice. The northern "it was accustomed amongst the lords, the first matter they always discussed after the mass of the Holy Ghost, . . . to affirm and allow the first clause of *Magna Charta* touching the rights and liberties of the Church, and it was not now so." Also, "that in any matter which touched the prerogative of the king's crown or any matter that touched the prejudice of the same, the custom of the lords' house was they should have upon their request a copy of the bill of the same," to examine it and get counsel about it. But "that they could now have no such copy upon their suit, or at the least so readily as they were wont to have in parliament before. And to his remembrance he thought default in those of the chancery, in their use of their office amongst the lords, and in the hasty reading of the bills and request of the speed of the same." The statute which gave the king generally all monasteries under £200 both Aske and lord Darcy considered "little better than void," as the particular houses were not stated.

* *Ibid.*, 241.

counties were undoubtedly mostly influenced by these considerations in their rebellion against Henry's government, and their objection against the excessive taxation, under which the nation groaned at this time, and to the new "statute of uses," was founded principally upon the ground that these had formed part of the demands of the Lincolnshire people.

The story of the actual rising is well known. The sketch that it is needful to give here may be best taken chiefly from the account given of it by Robert Aske himself. At the beginning of October of this year, 1536, Robert with his two brothers, John and Christopher, met at the house of his brother-in-law, William Ellerkar, for a hunting party. On the father's side the Askes were Yorkshire gentry of good descent. Their mother was a Clifford, daughter of John lord Clifford the stout Lancastrian who was killed on Towton field; and aunt of the first Clifford, Earl of Cumberland. John, the eldest of the three brothers, had the family estate of Aughton; Christopher possessed a property at Marshland, and Robert himself with a manor in Yorkshire, was a barrister in good practice at Westminster. The latter was on his way back to London, and when crossing over the Humber in the Barton ferry boat, he learnt from the ferryman for the first time "that the commons on the Lincolnshire side were up, had taken the king's commissioners and also the bishop's ordinary, and how

the voice was that their churches and ornaments of the same should be taken from them."

On landing at Barton, on the Lincolnshire side of the river, it was his intention to proceed to the house of a brother-in-law at Sawcliffe, but when two miles on his road he was met by a band of mounted insurgents, who forced him to take the oath to be true to the commons, and then conducted him to his destination. A few nights after, he and his three nephews were taken out of their beds by the people, but the three youths were allowed to go over to Yorkshire, "because two of them were heirs apparent." Robert Aske himself was forced to become the leader of the insurgents in this part, who were in number some 4,000. He appears to have accepted the position, and for some days endeavoured to organize the movement.

Leaving the southern side of the Humber after a short time, he crossed back into Yorkshire, where the rumour that he had been a leader in Lincolnshire, had already been spread. Almost immediately he prepared to return, but learnt the complete failure of the popular movement, and was obliged to fly. That night (October 13th), as he crossed the Trent, he saw the beacons blaze out over the waters and heard the clash of the alarm bells calling upon the northern counties to rise in defence of their rights. The people had adopted the demands of the commons of Lincolnshire, and as the spark was stamped out there, the flame burst forth again in all the

country, from the Humber to the Scotch marshes and from the Irish sea to the German ocean.

Aske passed once more over the Ouse into Howdenshire, where he found all the country astir. In places the "cross of the church" was with the villagers as their standard, and everywhere they "enforced gentlemen and heirs apparent to come unto them."*

The people had been deeply stirred by the religious changes. They would not tolerate the late order for the abolition of holidays of the church, and on Sunday, October 15—the first of the northern rising—public protests were made against the clergy carrying out this order. One vicar in the "bidding of beads" on this Sunday did not give out St. Luke's day (18th) as a holiday, "and after mass they thought to have murdered him. Wherefore for fear of his life he took the sacring bell in his hands, when they caused him to bid the beads again," and finally swore him "to be true to Almighty God, the faith of the Church to our sovereign lord the king and to the commonwealth."† On the previous Sunday the same difficulty had occurred elsewhere about St. Wilfrid's day (October 12). A witness declared "that upon the same Sunday being in his parish church, when he heard the parish priest at the bidding of beads leave out St. Wilfrid's day for a holy day, he asked the same priest openly then

* Chapter House Book, A. 2^o8, pp. 47-51.

† *Ibid.*, A. 2^o8, p. 155.

why he did leave it out, for it was wont always to be a holiday here. And the priest answered that the same feast and divers others were put down for divers causes by the king's authority and the consent of the whole clergy in convocation. And as soon as mass was done all the whole parish was in a rumour for the matter, and said they would have their holidays bid and kept as they had before, and so they had ever since."*

These matters, small as they may seem at this present time, must have conduced in every village throughout England to impress upon the minds of the people in those days the royal determination to interfere with the ancient traditional customs of the Church of England. They were scandalized at the unwonted exercise of authority by the temporal prince in things so purely ecclesiastical, and their fears must have conjured up visions of yet further

* *Ibid.*, p. 53. The articles published at Richmond were:—

"That all the commons in every township should rise in pain of death and take all lords and gentlemen and make them swear on the mass book to these articles following:

"(1) To maintain the profit of holy church, which was the householding of the Christian faith.

"(2) That no lord or gentleman shall take anything of their tenants; whole their rents to put down the lord Crumwell, that heretic, and all his set who made the king put down praying and fasting."

"(3) That no lord or gentleman shall go to London.

"(4) If any lord or gentleman do deny to take this oath, then to put them to death and put the next of his blood in his place. And if he deny, put him to death in like sort, so one after another until one of the blood will take the oath."

legislation in regard to matters more vital to the Christian faith, even if rumour had not by this time made such changes more than probable. Thus to most the "Pilgrimage of Grace" was undoubtedly a rising in defence of religion and Catholic practice, and the actors bound themselves by an oath to fight "for the preservation of Christ's church, of the realm, and of the king."

With 9,000 men or more Aske marched on York. In a letter to the mayor he urged him to give free access to the host, and as the city was fortified "neither with artillery nor gunpowder" this was conceded. The leader published an address in which the causes of the "assembly or pilgrimage" are stated, and an invitation is given to all to join in the work.* In the two days that the insurgents then remained at York, Aske "took order for religious houses suppressed, because the commons would need put them in again. Which order was set on the minster door at York to the intent all the houses suppressed should resort there and know how they should use themselves. Which order ran thus:—

"First that the prior and convent should enter in their monasteries suppressed, and by bill indented view how much goods were there remaining which before were theirs; and to keep the one part (of the indenture) and deliver the other part to the king's farmer: and to have necessary *victum et*

* State Papers, i., p. 466.

vestitum of the delivery of the said farmer, during the time of the petition to the king's highness: and to do divers service of God there as the king's bedemen and women. And in case the farmer refuse thus to do, then the convent to take of the same goods, by the delivery of two indifferent neighbours, by bill indented, the necessaries for their living during the said time."*

Acting on this many of the monks and nuns who had been ejected from their houses returned. "Work is done rapidly by willing hands, in the midst of a willing people. In the week which followed, by a common impulse, the king's tenants were universally expelled. The vacant dormitories were again peopled; the refectories were again filled with exulting faces."† "Though it were never so late when they returned," the monks "sang matins the same night."‡ The abbey of Sawley, which had been vacant since the 14th of May, and which had been, with all its moveables, sold to lord Darcy for close upon £400, was again occupied by the abbot and his twenty-one brethren,§ and "being the charitable relief of those parts, and standing in a mountain country and among three forests," the men of Craven, Kendal, Furness, and the districts, bound

* Chapter House Book, A. 2^o, p. 52.

† Earl of Oxford to Cromwell, quoted by Froude, iii., 133.

‡ Calendar, xi., 1319.

§ Exch. Aug. Off. Mins. Accts., 27-28 Hen. VIII., No. 178, m. 5.

themselves together to resist any attempt to seize it from the monks a second time.*

So, also, to take but one more example, the house of Ferriby, from which the prior, with his six canons, had been driven in August, already was partially re-established. The goods had been sold, the plate packed off to the royal treasury, and even the lead from the church roof and the two small bells were ready for sale.† The prior had been pensioned in July, so the insurgents took "20 nobles" from him "which were distributed among the soldiers for suffering him to be at home, and," says the informant, "it was done openly, he being noted to have deceived the king at the suppression of his house great goods."‡ The lands were in the keeping of Sir William Fairfax, the king's farmer, who "was disposed to make away the goods of the same house;" and hence at the petition of the neighbouring people "to make some stay or restraint of the same, seeing other houses were stayed," the leaders "bade them put two brothers of the same house within it, to see nothing wasted and to make stay till such time as some way were taken with all houses. For," concludes the witness, "many of the commons thought the houses ill-bestowed on such as he (Sir William) that neither keep house nor men about him. Which oversight of the king's

* Chapter House Book, A. $\frac{2}{28}$, p. 57.

† Exch. Aug. Off. Mins. Acct., 27-28 Hen. VIII., No. 178, m. 4d.

‡ Chapter House Book, A. $\frac{7}{28}$, p. 169.

farmers thereof hath done much hurt in those parts ; and especially of him, being a man of fair possessions, keeping a very small part, and no men about him."*

On Sunday, October 15, Aske and his followers entered York. Richmondshire and Durham had also risen, and the commons had seized the persons of lord Lumley, the earl of Westmoreland, and lord Latimer, and on Tuesday, the 17th, Aske had information that they were coming to join him. Pomfret castle, held by lord Darcy, was surrounded by the people, and the garrison was known to incline to the popular movement. On Thursday Aske summoned lord Darcy to surrender, and the following morning, October 19th, after a long parley, Aske was allowed to take possession of the stronghold, and Darcy, Sir Robert Constable, the archbishop of York and the others within its walls, took the oath of the "Pilgrimage of Grace."

Of all the Yorkshire strongholds Skipton and Scarborough alone held out for the king. The people daily flocked to the banner, and the host increased to an alarming size. "Lords Nevill, Latimer, and Lumley and 10,000 men, with the banner and arms of St. Cuthbert," and the men of Pickering and Blackmore, "with knights and gentlemen about 5,000," came to the support of Aske, so that when he moved forward on Doncaster he was followed by between thirty and forty thousand men "well tried on horseback." They marched under the banner of

* *Ibid.*

the pilgrims, which was practically that which the Lincoln men had adopted, and each wore on his arm a badge either with the "five wounds" worked upon it, or with a cross and I.H.S., which was used by those who came under "Saint Cuthbert's banner."

The earl of Shrewsbury was now at Doncaster with his armed tenantry, together with the duke of Norfolk and some 5,000 men. The river Don separated the opposing forces, and had battle been given there is little doubt that victory would have been on the side of the people. The duke of Norfolk, on his side, had received the king's special commandment "above all things, never to give stroke . . . unless you shall think yourself to have great and notable advantage for the same." And particularly if he found the rebels too strong for him, or if he thought "any of the company" with the earl of Shrewsbury "evil willing," he was to retire, and not hazard a fight. How he was to do this he left to the judgment of Norfolk himself, only recommending him his own "politic device," and warning him as to his "promises, to be made to the rebels for the stay of them, till your forces shall be come and joined with the others. Albeit we certainly know," the royal letter concludes, "that you will pretermitt no occasion wherein, by policy or otherwise, you may damage our enemies; yet we doubt not again, but in all your proceedings you will have such temperance, as our honour, specially shall remain untouched and yours rather increased than,

by the certain promise of that which you cannot certainly promise, appear anything defaced."*

On their side the insurgents appear to have been by no means anxious to shed the blood of their countrymen. Some, indeed, of the younger lords and gentry were eager to proceed to extremities at once; but their leader, Aske, reminded them that "it was no dishonour," and that "their whole duty was to declare their griefs to their sovereign lord to the intent that evil counsellors about his grace might be known and have punished."†

Actuated by such motives—the one side by what Henry called a "politic device . . . wherein you may damage our enemies," and the other apparently by a sincere desire to obtain their demands without bloodshed—the two forces agreed to a conference. The desires of the "pilgrims" were, at the request of the duke, drawn up in a set of articles, and at a second meeting on Doncaster bridge it was agreed that Norfolk should accompany two of the northern leaders to the king to present their demands; that the king's forces should retire from Doncaster, and the "pilgrim" army return to Pomfret.

A fortnight passed in suspense. Many of Aske's followers returned to their homes, weary of waiting, and he himself was fully occupied in his endeavours to keep the remainder from active aggression pend-

* State Papers, i., p. 494.

† Chapter H. Bk., A. $\frac{2}{3}$, p. 55. (Note lord Darcy "*playing the fool*").

ing the royal reply. From Craven came the news one morning that the earl of Derby was marching with a force to expel the reinstated monks of Sawley abbey, and that the people of the district were gathering to resist. Through the earl of Shrewsbury, Aske managed to stop the movement of lord Derby, and sent messages to the commons, "who had already attained Whalley abbey," to "withdraw them to the mountains" again.

The next day the leader had to be in York to quiet the people there; and then again the following morning he was off 14 miles away, at Watton priory of the order of Sempringham, on the same errand—"to stay the commons there who would have chosen a new prior because the said prior was fled to the lord Crumwell, being one of his promotion, and had left behind him brethren and sisters of the same house, nigh sixty or eighty and not forty shillings to succour them." Aske managed to pacify the people, and "deputed the sub-prior for the time to order the same house," as the prior was yet absent.

Again, the day following, the popular leader was at Hull, to see Sir Robert Constable, who held the town for the commons, and to examine the fortifications made against the duke of Suffolk, who was "directly against the town." That town had fallen into the possession of William Stapleton, one of the insurgent leaders, about the middle of October. During the few days in which it stood out against him there occurred an incident which shows how

determined the leaders of the movement were to prevent any acts of violence by their followers. Complaints had been made to Stapleton of the spoiling and thieving which was going on. He set a watch, and captured two in the act, and "made them believe they should die. And thereupon he assigned a friar to them, being in his company, advising them to make them clean to God, which the said William," who relates the story, "thinketh they did and looked for nothing but death. After the which, so done, the said William called for Spalding a waterman, and in the presence of all men caused them to be called out, and one, a sanctuary man, was tied by the middle with a rope to the end of the boat and so hauled over the water and at several times put down with the oar over the head."*

Meantime, whilst Aske was fully occupied in his endeavour to keep the people quiet, and hopeful that their petitions to Henry would be accepted, the royal agents were busy over two futile plots to secure his removal by assassination or betrayal. "Alas, my lord!" wrote lord Darcy to Norfolk, "that you, being a man of so great honour, should advise or choose me to betray any living man, Frenchman, Scot, yea, or even Turk. To win for me or for mine heirs the best duke's lands that be in France, I would not do it to no living person." †

In the middle of November the two insurgent

* Chapter H. Bk., A. $\frac{2}{25}$, p. 161.

† Quoted by Froude, iii., p. 169.

envoys, Ellerkar and Bowes, were sent back to the north "with general instructions of comfort," and with the information that the duke of Norfolk, with other commissioners, would follow after them with the royal reply. Henry had essayed several answers to the Yorkshire articles, but in each draft, annexed to the general pardon, was a reservation of certain persons to be excluded from it, and it was only finally in deference with the advice of the duke of Norfolk, that he could be induced to undertake to forego his royal vengeance entirely.

On November the 21st the insurgent leaders met at York to consider their future action. They had been invited to meet the king's commissioners at Doncaster, but they "debated long whether they should do so or not, because of a letter sent by lord Crumwell to Sir Ralph Evers. Wherein were these threats or such like: 'Except the commons of those parts soon would be pacified, there should be such vengeance taken upon them that the whole world should speak thereof and take example by them.'"*

It was agreed finally, however, to meet the duke at Doncaster with 300 persons, and "letters were sent to the clergy to stand for the articles profitable for the faith of the Church and liberties of the same." "But," writes Aske to Henry, "by reason of the same letters, and also for the extreme punishment of the great jury of Yorkshire, for Wickliff's cause and for the extreme assessment of their fines, the lord

* Chapter H. Bk., A. 2^o/₃, p. 59.

Crumwell was and yet (at the close of the first rising) is in such horror and hatred with the people in those parts that in a manner they would eat him, and esteem their griefs only to arise by him and his counsel, as the said commons there declared their minds to the herald Lancaster nigh Hampall in Yorkshire who can recount their words to your highness."*

Before the meeting at York broke up it was agreed that two days previous to the meeting at Doncaster the lords should assemble at Pomfret. As the royal commissioners approached the borders of Yorkshire, towards the close of the month of November, the beacons were lighted, and "bells rung backward," again recalling the scattered forces of the insurgents to the banner of their "pilgrimage." Norfolk sent back to the king letters "in such extreme and desperate sort, as though the world should be in a manner turned upside down, unless we," as Henry writes, "would in certain points condescend to the petition of the rebels."† The forces which the king had been able to get together during the delay were considered by his lieutenant altogether inadequate to face the 20,000 insurgents ready to meet them and hear the king's answer to their complaints. Henry again enjoined Norfolk "not indeed to meet with them but in such sort as shall be for your perfect surety." Still, he was to try and get them peacefully to accept the pardon he was instructed to offer.

* *Ibid.*, p. 60.

† State Papers, i., p. 512.

If, however, they refused to entertain such an offer, unless the pardon was "*general* and without exception," or demanded a parliament or proposed any other article, Norfolk was to say that his commission did not contemplate "the granting of any of those things," but that such was his love for them, and his fear lest they should act against the king foolishly, that he would himself go to the king, and writes Henry, "join with them as humble suitors and petitioners unto us."

Further, if the duke found that the people only demanded a free and general pardon and a parliament, then the king instructed him to pretend to go away for six or seven days as if for the purpose of going to him, "and when that time shall be expired, at the day to be prefixed, declare unto them that, with great dint, you had obtained their petitions, and so present unto them the general pardon." In fact, so far did this diplomacy of Henry go that Sir John Russell already had in his possession the general pardon, with instructions not to let anyone know of it.* It is obvious that for the purpose of obtaining delay, Henry, as he himself puts it, "therein waded, as far as possible, with our honour." As for Norfolk himself, he wrote to the king "all desperately," but, as the latter reminds him, "in the end you said you would esteem no promise that you should make to the rebels, nor think your honour touched in the breach and violation of the same."†

* State Papers, i., p. 511.

† *Ibid.*, p. 51

On Monday, November 27, the leaders of the insurgents met at Pomfret. The assembly comprised five peers, more than thirty knights, and, as Aske afterwards declared, "all or most part of the esquires of the said shire and gentlemen also."* They agreed to certain articles and conditions upon which they would lay down their arms. Simultaneously the clergy who were in the town, with archbishop Lee at their head, met in the church to consider their answer to a set of ten articles proposed to them, or, as one witness described it, the archbishop took "certain clerks to discuss their griefs." And "as it was amongst them that were in his company, the archbishop of York held the same opinion" (that the movement was "good and gracious") "at the beginning, but now at the last meeting he preached to the contrary."† Still, as Aske afterwards declares, the people "would have the clergy's opinions touching the articles concerning our faith to the intent they should make their articles to the lords at Doncaster certain." And he added, "if the clergy did declare their minds contrary to the laws of God it was a double iniquity."‡

The assembly of clergy, in spite of the sermon of archbishop Lee, drew up a brief set of articles which rejected as unlawful all that Henry had done in his ecclesiastical legislation. Convocation, they declared, should condemn preaching against pur-

* Chapter House Bk., A. $\frac{2}{28}$, p. 60. † *Ibid.*, p. 232.

‡ *Ibid.*, A. $\frac{2}{29}$, pp. 91-93.

gatory, pilgrimages, saints, and images, and also all books against the same teaching should be condemned; the pains and punishment of heretics decreed by Henry IV. ought to be executed. Holidays, bidding of bedes, and preaching should be observed according to the ancient custom of the Church. "No temporal man might be supreme head of the Church, or exercise any jurisdiction or power spiritual therein; no temporal man had authority by the laws of God to claim the tenths or first-fruits of any spiritual promotion." Lands given to God, to the Church, or religion might not be taken away and put to profane uses. The pope of Rome ought to be taken for the head of the Church. Clerks now in prison or fled the country for withstanding the king's superiority in the Church should be set at liberty and restored; apostates from religion, not dispensed by the pope, should be obliged to return to their houses.* The articles, of which the above are the most important, were presented to the leaders of the movement, who sent forward to Doncaster for a safe conduct from the duke. And on Wednesday Aske and 300 followers crossed the bridge over the Don into the town. They were lodged at the Grey Friars, and on Thursday, the last day of November, they made choice of "20 knights, squires and commons," with Aske as their spokesman, to proceed to "the White Friars to the duke and earls." Entering into Norfolk's presence, "and all making their low

* Dixon, i., p. 473.

obeisance and kneeling on their knees," they asked for the king's pardon, and Norfolk appears to have satisfied the leader of the king's intention in respect to their demands, and chiefly as regards the general pardon and the parliament to be held in some place appointed by the king within the year.

Aske retired first to the Grey Friars, where he told his followers, and then on to Pomfret to the main body of the host. Early the following morning he sent the "bellman" round the town ordering the commons to come to the "market cross" to receive the king's pardon, telling them they were to receive it under the great seal. The people "gave a great shout of joy" at the news, and the whole body of the insurgents moved onward with their leader. "And incontinent," continues Aske's narrative, "came there a letter from the lord Lumley how the said commons would not be satisfied except they saw the king's most merciful pardon under seal, and that the abbots new put in of houses suppressed should not void their possessions to the parliament time," adding that "the parliament should be at York or else they would burn beacons and raise the whole country."

But Aske was satisfied with the assurances of Norfolk and trusted to the honour of Henry, and so returned at once to Pomfret, where he persuaded the people who were assembled there, to the number of some 3,000, to accept the pardon. His reasoning prevailed, and the royal herald arriving the same night

with the document ; early the following morning they all assembled on "St. Thomas' Hill," outside Pomfret, and receiving the pardon at once departed to their homes.

Once more Aske returned to Doncaster and, in the presence of the duke of Norfolk and the earls, he and his followers tore off the "badges and crosses with five wounds" as a token that their "pilgrimage" was at an end, exclaiming : "We will wear no badge nor figure but the badge of our sovereign lord."*

Thus ended the first act of the "Pilgrimage of Grace." The sequel of the story, the part borne in the movement by the monks and the punishment meted out to the vanquished, will be briefly related in the next chapter.

* Chad. H. Bk., A. ²/₂₆, p. 63.

CHAPTER IV.

THE SECOND NORTHERN RISING.

INFLUENCED by Aske's advice, the northern bands quickly dispersed to their homes. The leader himself trusted implicitly to the royal promises made through the duke of Norfolk, and unhesitatingly performed his part in the compact. That the king's government had been in the greatest danger of overthrow cannot be questioned, and the persistency and earnestness with which the fidelity of the few troops Henry had collected to oppose the forward movement of the insurgents, is asserted, leads to a suspicion of even their loyalty to his cause. As early as the beginning of November, the king had been anxious to discount the effect of the news of this fresh rising at the foreign courts. For this reason, as he had done in the case of the Lincolnshire disturbances, Henry wrote to his ambassadors in France the account he wished circulated abroad. So that, as he tells them, "you may boldly affirm the same to be true to all men and in all presences where you shall have any occasion, cause or opportunity to speak thereof." Judged by the documents, the king's account of the movement is far from being correct in any particular. The whole insurrection, he declares, was planned by those who wished to

obtain plunder during the tumult, an intention which is conspicuously absent during the entire affair. He says further that when the people learnt they had been deceived by their leaders they "much lamented their offences therein committed," and humbly "desired pardon for the same." "And as concerning the Yorkshire men," he continues, "they do already, being thus retired, lament their traitorous attempt and make great suit and labour for their pardon; so that we have no doubt but we shall in time dispose of them as we will and bring them to like submission, as is already made by them of Lincolnshire. . . . And yet do both shires remain wholly at our commandment, neither having our pardon, nor any certain promise of the same. And therefore you may be bold not only to declare the premises, as they be before specified, but also to affirm that, against every of the insurrections of those shires (being one attempted after another, and yet chiefly by one principal actor) we had in readiness, and that within six days for every of them, such two armies, as we think would first have devoured the said rebels and yet have remained right able, every of them, after to have given battle to the greatest prince christened. And surely we be as much bound to God, as ever was prince, both for that we found our subjects so forward, so willing, and so ready to have fought against the rebels that we were rather enforced to keep them back and to cause great numbers to retire home to their countries, than, by

any manner of allurements, to prick them forward. . . . We have them again in so good quiet, without effusion of blood or the striking of any stroke by either party, which is somewhat strange, and, peradventure, hath not been often seen—they (the insurgents) being, as is said, such a multitude, as, doubt you not, had been able, well furnished with artillery, ordnance, and good captains, to have overthrown the better of either the emperor's or French king's army."* The manifest contradictions and falsehoods contained in this royal letter need not be pointed out; but the document is of interest as showing the worth of the king's word, upon the faith of which the insurgents had laid down their arms.

But notwithstanding the king's round assertions the truth had been understood. On the 24th of December Crumwell wrote to the same ambassadors, Gardiner, bishop of Winchester, and Sir John Wallop, with respect to rumours which had been circulated as to the methods employed in staying the insurrection, and the need in which the king stood which compelled him to come to terms. It was altogether false, he says, that the "commons assembled for the king's part, were so faint and unwilling, that they would not have done their duties if it had come to extremity." Still he admits that it was so reported in the country, but states "that the most part of the king's retinue in manner wept when they were commanded to return, considering

* Tierney's "Dodd," i., p. 430. Quoted from "the original in my possession."

the rebels were not more extremely punished."* However this may be, it is certain that the duke of Norfolk had no confidence in the forces at his disposal. Both he and Henry were unwilling to "adventure the king's honour in battle," and the king left the matter to his discretion, although the council told the duke of their "regret to receive so many desperate letters, and, in the same, to hear no mention of the remedies."†

With regard to the promises made to the rebels, the conclusion of Crumwell's letter, written a few weeks after the duke of Norfolk had made them in the king's name, shows how little Henry regarded them as obligatory on his part. "It is reported," the letter runs, "that the matter should be taken up with conditions and articles. It is true that, at the beginning, the rebels made petition to have obtained certain articles; but, in the end they went from all, and remitted all to the king's highness pleasure, only in most humble and reverent sort, desiring their pardon, with the greatest repentance that could be devised; insomuch as in their chief article, which, next their pardon, was for a parliament, for that they might have their pardon therein confirmed, they remitted the appointment of the same wholly to the king's majesty, without the naming of time, place, or any other thing touching that matter: and this discourse may you declare to all men for truth; for no man with truth can impugn the same."‡

* *Ibid.*, p. 432.

† Hardwicke Pap., i., 28.

‡ Tierney's "Dodd," i., p. 433.

If the people were deceived, they had at the time no notion of any such deception, neither did they in any way abandon their demands, as Crumwell in the foregoing letter implies. Aske, in his narrative to the king, speaks of "the articles now concluded at Doncaster, which were drawn, read, argued and agreed among the lords and esquires" at Pomfret, and whether Norfolk exceeded his power or not in treating with Aske and his followers, a distinct agreement was made and signed. "The pardon and the parliament," writes Mr. Froude, "were distinctly promised. It appears, certainly, that further engagements were virtually entered upon, or that words were used, perhaps intentionally vague, which were interpreted by the insurgents through their hopes and wishes. They believed, perhaps they were led to believe, that their entire petition had been granted; they had accomplished the object of their pilgrimage and they were satisfied."*

From the meeting at Doncaster Aske went to the abbeys of Haltemprice and Ferriby, into which the expelled religious had been again brought by the "pilgrims," and pending the decision of the expected northern parliament arranged that the king's farmers should be reinstated in their charges.† The resumption by the religious of their old houses and lands during the few weeks of the insurrection and the consequent expulsion of the royal officials had been a bold step. It is probable that, however willing the

* I., p. 176.

† Chapter House Bk., A. 2, p. 63.

monks had been to regain possession of their monasteries, they had no part in the actual work of disposing the king's receivers. From Aske's narrative it is clear that the people had determined not only to put a stop to future suppressions, but to demand the restoration of those houses which had already passed into the hands of Henry. Thus, as has been pointed out in the last chapter, the people round about Ferriby priory had insisted upon two of the old religious possessors being placed there again, as Sir William Fairfax, the king's farmer, "was disposed to make away the goods of the same house."

In the same way the people were moved with indignation at the suppression of the neighbouring priory of Haltemprice. The sales of the goods of the monastery bringing into the hands of the receiver nearly £250, and the transport of chests popularly supposed to contain the plate and valuables of the priory from the neighbourhood, determined them to put a stop to any further depredation. William Stapleton, one of the leaders of the movement, declares that he was told "that great treasure of the king's lay at Beckwith's house at Southcave, which came from the abbeyes of Ferriby and Haltemprice. Whereupon to please the people and to save the goods, if any were there, the said William took with him certain honest persons and kept the light persons from such things as much as he could, and he there found a woman keeping the house, and alighting from his horse he went in taking with him

not above six persons, and the rest stood at the door, and he asked where the priest was . . . who was there hid for fear of certain light persons who had been there before the coming of the said William, and threatened to spoil the goods and slay the priest. But when the priest knew who asked for him he came forth quivering and shaking for fear. And the said William asked him what treasure was in the two great iron chests: and he said nothing but evidences. The said William to satisfy the commons said it was like to be so, yet it was like to have been plate or other treasure." But the priest in the end "showed him a letter of Beckwith's hand for the conveyance of the said chests, wherein it appeared they were evidence."*

After the meeting at Doncaster and the dispersal of the people to their homes the king's heralds were sent round about the northern countries to proclaim the royal pardon. In so doing the envoy was directed to note well the demeanour of the people and to find out whether they had settled down to their occupations or were still disturbed. If he thought it well to make the declaration he should declare the king's sorrow that, after twenty-eight years during which he had "ever tendered them in all things rather like his natural children than like his subjects," they should listen to false tales about him. What the king had done, he should tell them, had he approval of the parliament and the clergy. Then

* *Ibid.*, p. 155.

“with gentle words” he should declare “how the king having a main army of 50,000 men besides that force which was addressed against them,” still on account of his affection for them directly he heard they had retired, determined not to advance and punish them as they deserved. Having said this much the herald was to read the proclamation, and have it fixed to the Market Cross or other public place, which shall be strictly watched to see whether anyone tear it down. “And finally” the officer “shall in all his journey, diligently, secretly and substantially ensearch, what monks, canons, nuns or other religious persons, of any religious houses, within the limitation of the act of suppression, having been discharged by his grace's commissioners, be again restored, by any of the rebels to the possessions of their said houses; how they use themselves in the same; and of what inclination the people is for their continuance.”*

An instance of the way in which the directions issued by the king for the proclamation of his pardon were observed, is given in the examination of William Colyns, the bailiff of the town of Kendal. “And on the morrow after our Lady's day before Christmas,” runs the record, “they received the king's gracious pardon at Pomfret, which they have to show in Kendal town under the king's broad seal at this examinat's house, brought by Clarencieux the herald about fourteen days before

* State Papers, i., 473.

our said Lady's day. Which herald made proclamation in Kendal town the said fourteenth day of the king's said pardon. And because certain farmers of priories about sent to him showing him how divers brethren took away their corn from them, and therefore like to have been murder between them about the same, therefore the said herald gave commandment openly in the king's name, upon pain of high treason, that no man should disturb any man about the possession of lands and tithes; but they should be in like manner as they were at the last meeting at Doncaster and so continue till the duke of Norfolk came again to the country, which should be about the twentieth day after Christmas. Which done, as the herald was departing away, came two of the brethren of the late priory of Cartmell, and desired the herald to write unto them the same order that they might show it to their neighbours. And he said he could not tarry so to do, but desired this examinat to write them a word or two of the effect of the said order. And thereupon this examinat at his request and to the intent to have the said brethren to keep them out of danger of the king's statutes, wrote unto them the said order of this effect: 'Neighbours of Cartmell, so it is that the king's herald has made proclamation here that every man (under) pain of high treason should suffer everything, as farms, tithes and such other to be in like stay and order concerning possession, as they were in the time of the

last meeting at Doncaster, except you will of your charity help the brethren there somewhat towards their board.'"*

As he "showed me," says a witness, "that all the canons of Cartmell had entered the house except the foolish prior who would not go to them," I wrote to him. As far as I remember "it was to this effect: Forasmuch as all religious persons in the north parts had entered their houses by putting in of commons, and I am informed that you, meaning the prior of Cartmell, being required so to enter do withdraw yourself, I think you may safely enter and do as others do, keeping yourself quiet for the season and praying for the king. And at the next parliament then to do as shall be determined, and I have no doubt but so doing you may continue in the same with the grace of God who keep you." The letter was written from York on the ninth of December, and the writer declared that he sent it, because it was openly said at the time both at Pomfret and York that the abbeys should continue "in such manner as they were put in, unto the next parliament." For this same reason, and because he "understood that such was the promise made at Doncaster," he spoke in the same way to prior Coke of St. Agatha's.†

The letter to Cartmell probably confirmed the brethren there in their determination to hold to their

* Chapter House Bk., A. $\frac{2}{26}$, p. 250.

† Chapter House Bk., A. $\frac{2}{28}$, p. 345.

old home. Their trust in thus relying on the herald's word was terribly expiated, for as Colyns, the bailiff of Kendal, declared in his examination: "After this, four of the brethren of the said house of Cartmell and eight yeomen were put to execution for withstanding the king's farmer Mr. Holcrofte and stirring up a new commotion about eight weeks after (the letters) without the knowledge of this examinat or any other man of Kendal to his witting."*

It does not seem open to doubt that Aske endeavoured to restrain the people and prevent any further attempt at insurrection in the expectation that Henry would redeem his promises made at Doncaster. A fortnight after the people had dispersed to their homes the king wrote to him pressing him to come and see him. "We have conceived," he says, "a great desire to speak with you and to hear of your mouth the whole circumstance and beginning of that matter," and he promises that he will "accomplish towards you and all others, our general and free pardon, already granted unto you."†

In obedience to this summons Aske travelled to the south and remained some time with the king. At his wish he wrote out a full and complete history of his connection with the rising and a straightforward and honest declaration of the various causes which led to the disturbance. It is from this inval-

* Chapter House Bk., A. $\frac{2}{20}$, p. 250.

† State Papers, i., p. 523.

able document that many of the details of the rising are known, and it has become evident how keenly the people of the North felt the destruction of the religious houses and the various ecclesiastical innovations introduced by Henry.*

Aske remained for some short time with the king, and was then sent back to the North with fresh assurances of the king's intention of abiding by the pledges given by Norfolk. But meantime the people were becoming disheartened by the long delay and doubtful of the royal intention. The fact that Crumwell remained apparently as high as ever in Henry's favour in spite of all the objections they had urged against him, and that rumour had spoken of the massing of royal troops round about the disaffected counties, and of the strengthening of the defences of Hull and elsewhere, seemed to show that Henry had no intention of keeping faith with them. On his return to Yorkshire Aske saw the danger and immediately wrote to inform the king of the agitation. "I do perceive," he said, "a marvellous conjecture in the hearts of the people, which is, they do think they shall not have the parliament in convenient time; secondly, that your grace hath by your letters written for the most part of the honourable and worshipful of the shires to

* It is significant that whilst the filthy scribbles of Layton and his compeers have been printed and reprinted and their reports dinned into people's ears for the last two centuries, such a weighty document as Aske's "expostulatory narrative to the king," drawn up at Henry's express request to Aske in person, has never yet seen the light.

come to you, whereby they fear not only danger to them, but also to their own selves; thirdly, they be in doubt of your grace's pardon by reason of a late book answering their first articles, now in print, which is a great rumour amongst them; fourthly, they fear the danger of fortifying holds, and especially because it is said that the duke of Suffolk would be at Hull and to remain there; fifthly, they think your grace intendeth not to accomplish their reasonable petitions by reason now the tenths is in demand; sixthly, they say the report is my lord privy seal (Crumwell) is in as great favour with your grace as ever he was, against whom they most specially do complain; finally, I could not perceive in all the shires, as I came from your grace homewards, but your grace's subjects be wildly minded in their hearts towards commotions or assistance thereof, by whose abetment yet I know not; wherefore, sir, I beseech your grace to pardon me in this my rude letter and plainness of the same, for I do utter my poor heart to your grace to the intent your highness may perceive the danger that may ensue; for on my faith I do greatly fear the end to be only by battle."*

It would appear that Aske was loyal to the king in his implicit belief that the promises made at Doncaster would be adhered to. The letter given above, together with his narrative of the events, hardly admit of a doubt that he was honest in his endeavour

* Froude, iii., p. 182.

to restrain the people from any further aggressive measures. John Halom, one of those most deeply compromised by the second rising, declared at his examination that Aske had done what he could to prevent it,* and in this opinion he was borne out by most of the witnesses. Lord Darcy also joined Aske in this attempt to preserve the peace. He, like the leader, had been invited to journey to Windsor to see the king, but although he had excused himself on the plea of such ill-health that "he was more like to die than to recover thereof,"† he wrote several letters advising the people to trust to the king's promises and to his looking to their grievances.‡ He also declared to the lord admiral in a letter written on the 20th of January, 1537, that Aske, Babthorp, Ellerker, Constable and he himself were doing their best to quiet the restless humour of the people. "And Sir Richard Tempest," he adds, "is sent home . . . with good comfortable words of the parliament for spiritual and temporal men, and of the king's free and mere pardon of his own benign grace granted, and that true justice shall have place against all that was in the bill of article." And if the duke of Norfolk only come to promise this, he concludes, "he will accomplish more than 40,000 men could."§

On the eve of Sir Francis Bygod's rising letters were sent to him and the commons with him urging

* Chapter House Bk., A. $\frac{2}{29}$, p. 48.

† *Ibid.*, pp. 1, 3, 7.

† *Ibid.*, B. $\frac{2}{21}$, p. 40.

§ *Ibid.*, p. 21.

them to pause. With these Sir Robert Constable, on January 18th, sent a paper saying that "the king's highness hath declared by his own mouth unto Robert Aske that we shall have our parliament at York frankly and freely for the ordering and reforming of all causes for the commonwealth of this realm; and also his frank and free convocation for the good stay and ordering of the faith and other spiritual causes."*

It was, however, this very confidence in the royal honesty which was afterwards construed into high treason, and for which lord Darcy, Aske and many others were executed. In the notes upon the evidence against them it is stated that a letter from Darcy to Aske, written on January 21st, declared that the duke of Norfolk was to come into the North "to proclaim a free parliament to be kept there, and also free liberty to the spirituality to utter their learning;" also that in this parliament all grievances were to be considered. This shows, the author of the "note" rightly infers, that lord Darcy still looked for reform, "which," he continues, "is high treason." Moreover, in a letter to the duke of Suffolk, he asked that "the appointments made at Doncaster on the king's part should be observed," and this again, says the annotator, proves that he is a "traitor" still. The same deductions are made from the letters and actions of Robert Aske subsequent to the pardon, whereby the very reliance he

* *Ibid.*, p. 131.

placed upon the plighted word of Henry is counted as proof of a traitorous disposition.*

It is unnecessary to follow the history of the several risings, by which the people endeavoured to force attention to their disappointed hopes. Sir Francis Bygod and others endeavoured to seize Hull and Beverley in the beginning of January, and were captured in the attempt. The leaders of the first rising lost no time in repudiating the new movement, and Aske received a letter from the king, thanking him for his services in endeavouring to put an end to it.† Various commotions followed in the northern parts which culminated in an attack upon Carlisle by some eight thousand men of Westmoreland. They failed in their attempt, and only afforded the duke of Norfolk a pretext for advancing, with an army upon which he could rely, into the disturbed districts. Martial law was proclaimed and remorseless executions finally broke the resistance of the people.

These ill-judged and hopeless disturbances afforded the king an excuse for breaking off the convention of Doncaster. Even those who had in reliance upon the royal promises done their best to restrain the impatience of the people, found themselves involved in the consequences of their former acts although they had sued and obtained pardon for them. Aske, whose good offices in keeping the people quiet had been acknowledged by Henry, and lord Darcy who

* *Ibid.*, A. $\frac{2}{28}$, pp. 241-247.

† State Papers, i., 529.

had certainly taken no part in such risings, found themselves prisoners in the royal power.

Before speaking of the final act in the drama of the Pilgrimage of Grace—the trials and executions of those implicated in the movement—the special attention of the reader must be directed to the part taken in it by the religious. The king, in his letter just quoted, declared that “all these troubles have ensued by the solicitation and traitorous conspiracies of the monks and canons of those parts.” It will be of interest to see how far such an assertion, borne out apparently by the numerous executions of abbots and monks, is confirmed by the depositions and examinations of witnesses and prisoners, on which alone, if justice had had its course, their condemnation or acquittal should have rested.

Speaking of the beginning of the insurrection, William Stapleton accuses an Observant friar of being implicated in the movement. He was staying, he says, at the Grey Friars, Beverley, with his elder brother Christopher, “a very weak, crazed and impotent man,” who had been ill for some sixteen years and was at that time at the Friars “for change of air,” as he “had been the summer before from May till after midsummer.” William, who was on his way to London, could not leave as he intended on October 4th, because he heard that the “commons of Lincolnshire” had risen, and so he remained on from day to day, till Sunday, the 8th, when the people about Beverley joined in the movement.

William Stapleton tried to keep his people indoors, but his brother's wife would not be controlled, and went to the hedge, crying out, "God's blessing have ye and speed ye well in your good purpose." The people asked where her people were, "and she replied, 'They be in the Friars. Go pull them out by the heads.'" For this she was blamed by both brothers, but she replied "that it was certainly God's quarrel." With the people at this time, as Stapleton declared, was "one Sir Thomas Johnson, otherwise called Bonaventure, an Observant friar, who was sworn and had been much with the said Christopher both at his house at Wighill and at Beverley, and before that time was assigned to the said house of Beverley by Doctor Vavasour, warden of the Grey Friars at York. And the said Bonaventure supervised much the rising, and was very busy going betwixt the wife of Sir Christopher and the said wild people, oft laying scriptures to maintain their purpose."*

It was apparently at the suggestion of the same friar that William Stapleton was forced to become the leader of the people, and subsequently as he says "the Observant offered himself to go into the quarrel in harness to the field and so did to the first stay." The same witness accuses "Sir Robert, a friar of St. Robert's of Knaresborough," of working hard to stir up the people to join the movement, and these two are about the only individual names mentioned as connected with the rising and not belong-

* Chapter House Bk., A. $\frac{3}{28}$, p. 150.

ing to abbeys well known in history as attained for their supposed part in the Pilgrimage of Grace.

In the second rising, the Gilbertine priory of Watton, on which a new prior had been imposed against the wish of the community by Cromwell, was said to be mixed up with the movement. The story is best told in the words of one William Horsekey when examined as to his knowledge of the matter. "Upon Monday, was a fortnight," he says, "which was ploughday after that (Christmas day) the said Hallam, Hugh Langdale and this examinat had a drinking together at one John Bell's in Watton with many other of the parishioners, being there together in great number as the manner is there of ploughdays, and every man departed homeward. The said Hallam, Hugh Langdale and this examinat, with the vicar of Watton, as they passed by the church of Watton turned in the same to say a *pater noster*, and there being, the said Hallam called this examinat and the said Langdale to an altar, called our Lady's altar, and said unto them: "Sirs I fear me lest Hull do deceive us the commons, for there is ordnance daily received there by ships." He then went on to declare that the king was not going to keep his promises and that they must look to themselves. Aske, as the witness declared, did all he could to prevent the second rising, which was "for the pulling down abbeys," and the payment "of tenths."

"Also he saith," continues the document, "that the subprior, the confessor of the nuns, and the vicar

of Watton . . . are great favourers and setters forth of this matter of sedition, for he heard them and every of them since Christmas last, at sundry times say that it would never be well as long as the king's grace should be the supreme head of the Church, and that the same would not be reformed without the people did set forward again with a new insurrection. And upon his conscience he thinketh that there is never a good one of all the canons of the said house of Watton, but that every one of them is glad to set forward this business. And he saith that they all great(ly) grudge their prior and would fain have a new one."*

Hugh Langdale who was named in this witness's evidence was servant to "the prior of Watton," and was away with his master in London during the late troubles. He was examined himself and declared that both Hallam and Sir Francis Bygod remained two days at the priory. "In the which time," he said, "as this examinat learned there at the table, being a servant of the house, the said Bygod and Hallam 'commoned' of the prior that he was not lawfully put in. And Hallam advised and commanded the brethren of the said house, upon pain of losing all they had, to choose them another prior. And for that intent the subprior sent this examinat to Beverley to fetch out Thorland a notary to come to the said house."

Hallam in his examination admits taking Langdale

* Chapter House Bk., A. $\frac{2}{29}$, pp. 41-45.

into the church to "swear him on a book" for fear he should send word "to his master the prior of Watton being then in London." He further states that Sir Francis Bygod at Watton priory declared the Doncaster articles bad because they did not run in the king's name, but began: "Albeit the king's highness," etc. He thought "it was but lord Crumwell's deed, and said further that the king's office was to have no cure of man's soul, and did read a book made as he said by himself (Bygod) wherein was showed what authority did belong to the pope, what to a bishop and what to the king. And said that the head of the Church of England might be a spiritual man, as the archbishop of Canterbury or such like, but in no wise the king, for he should, with the sword, defend all spiritual men in their right."

Hallam also declares that Bygod "said before the subprior (of Watton) and most part of his brethren that the prior was not lawfully chosen, for he was lord Crumwell's chaplain and admitted by him. And (whereas) he should have been chosen by free election, he was chosen but by three or four of his religion. And in that, this examinat (Hallam) thought and said that he spake but the truth, for all the time he was there the prior was good to no man. And of this examinat he took twenty marks in money, where he should have been paid in corn when God should send it. And (he) gave many unkind words and rebukeful to his tenants, sitting in

his court more like a judge than a religious man." . . . For these reasons, then, Bygod advised the brethren at Watton to elect another prior saying "he would draw them a draft how they should proceed and counselled them to send for a notary therefor, for he thought that the commons would be up shortly again and then it were not meet that they should be without a head and governor." In this advice Hallam confesses he joined, because, as he says, "the subprior and brethren aforesaid would fain have had a new prior among them."*

In the examination of the religious of Watton themselves much the same evidence was elicited. The subprior, "D. Harry Gill," says they were asked by the insurgents for money and horses. They gave only £10 and a gelding and "also Master Aske had one spice plate of silver, which was a pledge of the earl of Northumberland," and if it had not been sent the house would have been "spoiled." He declared that the archbishop of York sent a letter "to all curates and religious that they should go a procession every day and send their minds out of Holy Scripture and the four doctors touching the commons' petition." From their house two replies were sent, one from a "Dr. Swinburne" and another "from a young man of our habit called Thomas Asheton" . . . "and they were both one as touching the Supreme Head."

With regard to the election of a prior in place of

* *Ibid.*, p. 59.

the one appointed over them by Crumwell, and who had fled, the subprior deposed that at the time of the first insurrection Hallam came "with a great number of his soldiers after him into the infirmary of Watton where the brethren were bound to dinner, and there in the presence of the prior of Ellerton and the prior of St. Andrew's, York, charged the brethren to elect them a new prior. And they said it was against their order and statutes of their religion, their prior being alive, and not lawfully removed. Then he said if they did not, he would spoil their house, and he would nominate one himself. And said: 'Methinks this man'—pointing to the prior of Ellerton—'is meet to be your prior.' Then for fear of spoiling of their goods, as they say, they met together and did nominate the said prior of Ellerton to be their prior." He, however, would not take the office, "nor they received him for such indeed, but to have him to bear the name only through fear of the commons." *

Lastly, examined as to the crucial question of the "Supreme Headship" of the king, the subprior declared that for himself "he had no learning to discuss the matter; but as he saith it was in every man's mouth that if that were not laid down† it should not be well."

* *Ibid.*, pp. 77-80. It will be remembered that Aske declared he had gone at this time to Watton to prevent this new election from taking effect.

† *i.e.*, if the king did not put aside the title of Supreme Head which he had assumed.

The answers of two other religious of Watton* do not add anything to the declaration of the superior, although they confirm its accuracy in every particular. It may, therefore, be supposed that in these various declarations and examinations there are stated the various ways in which the priory of Watton was implicated in the rising. None of the canons took any active part in the movement, their contributions were small and even these were extorted by force. As for the matter of the election, however much they disliked the superior appointed by Crumwell, and whatever cause they had to endeavour to get rid of him, they appear to have acted loyally to him, except in so far as they were compelled to give way to force.

Beyond the foregoing isolated instances the numerous depositions and relations reveal no accusation against monastery or monk of any active co-operation with the insurgents, with the exception of the abbeys of Jervaulx and Whalley, the priory of Bridlington and the connection of the quondam abbot of Fountains with the movement. These cases must now be considered.

With respect to Jervaulx, the chief witness against the monks is Ninian Staveley, himself one of the leaders of the movement and a representative of the swashbuckler element among the insurgents. He

* That of "J. D. Thomas Lather, cellarer and granator," is prefaced by the expressions, "*Jesus sit in adjutorio*," "*Jesu adjuva me*, and "*Deus in adjutorium*."

engaged in the movement, as an adventure rather than as a pilgrimage, and having compromised himself endeavoured to save his own neck by incriminating others. By his deposition it would appear that the abbot during the second rising had promised to come to the insurgents "with all his brethren;" and that at the same time he had sent a messenger to Sir Thomas Percy "to have him come forward," and also a servant into Lincolnshire to find out the state of the country, and to let them know whether the duke of Norfolk was advancing "with arms or no."* These form the chief points of the abbot's offending, and they may be considered best in the light of his own examination in the Tower on 27th of April, 1537. "Adam Sedbar, abbot of the monastery of Jervaulx, 'sworn and examined,' said that during the first rising, about Michaelmas day, there 'came to the garth or court of the abbey of Jervaulx,' some two or three hundred men. He knew nothing about it at that time, but hearing that their captains, Middleton and Staveley, were asking for him, 'he conveyed himself by a back door' to a place 'called Wilton Fell.' He only had a boy with him, and 'bade his other servants get them every man to his house and save their cattle and goods.' He remained thus concealed for four days, only coming home at night," and for all those days the said commons wandered about the said house in the country about. . . . "At the last,

* Chapter House Bk., A. $\frac{2}{28}$, pp. 117, 118.

hearing say that this examinat had said that there should no servant of his ever after do him service, nor tenant dwell on no land of his that should go with them, they therefore turned back to Jervaulx and inquired for this examinat, and they were answered that this examinat was not at home. And then said they: 'We charge you brethren to go and choose you a new abbot.' Whereupon the brethren rang the chapter bell and went towards making of a new election. And certain among them would in no wise agree to make any new abbot. Then the commons gave them half an hour's respite to choose one; and if they did choose none in that space they would burn their house over their heads. Then the brethren sent several ways about to seek this examinat, and at last one William Nelson came where this examinat was upon Wilton Fell in a great crag, and showed him that the commons would burn the house except he should come home, and all the brethren cried 'Woe be (us).'

"Then for saving of the house this examinat came home (and) about the outer gate he was torn (from his horse) and almost killed, they crying 'Down with that traitor.' And at last by means of some of his friends he was carried in from them. And when he came to the hall entry one Leonard Burgh, one of the ringleaders, drew his dagger and would have killed him, but for them that stood by. Then he came further where one William Asleby, chief captain of these parts, was, and he said to this examinat:

'Horeson traitor, where has thou been?' and said: 'Get me a block to strike off his head upon,' and there this examinat was commanded to take the oath, which he took, the said Burgh ministering the same to him. And so took this examinat with them forthwith and gave him no respite, but caused him to ride with them upon a brown horse, which he rode upon his coming into them."

He was forced to remain with them for some days, but at last, through the intercession of one of the leaders, was allowed to return home. To Jervaulx, during this time, were sent the letters from the "commons" of the district, to receive which and forward to their destination certain of the insurgents were quartered on the monks. This continued till the settlement at Doncaster, when the strangers left.

In answer to the inquiry as to what aid he had given the insurgents, the abbot replied "that the commons took all his servants with them . . . but (that) he never gave one of them one penny of wages." Further, "he saith," continues the record, "he never sent victuals unto them. And that the commons took with them two of this examinat's brethren* among them, against this examinat's mind and will, who returned again with this examinat."

"Examined whether and how he gave money to Staveley at the last commotion there, he saith; that

* From the notes on this examination (Chapter House Bk., $\frac{2}{21}$ B., p. 140) it appears that the names of these two were Roger Hartlepool and John Stanton.

where this examinat had lost some 30 wethers, on one James his 'storer's' advice he spake with Edward Middleton in the Christmas holidays, because he was a hunter, that he should inquire for his sheep and he should have of this examinat for his labour, and he said he would. Then about three weeks after, this examinat met the said Middleton by chance in the abbey church of Jervaulx and asked him whether he had any word of this examinat's sheep: and he said 'no' albeit he had made the best inquiry he could as he said. Then said this examinat: 'Seeing ye have taken pains although ye could do no good I shall give you somewhat to drink for your labour.' And he forthwith commanded the said James his 'storer' who stood by to give him two shillings or three, and fourpence. And he said he had no single money. Then said this examinat 'Go to the cellarer or the quondam of Fountains and bid one of them give' the money."

Four or five days after this "there came to this examinat's chamber immediately after breakfast" Staveley and Middleton, "and his son and heir, and many more were in the hall." Staveley told the abbot that formerly he had deceived the people, "and therefore bade him come with them and half a dozen of his brethren forthwith. And this examinat desired them to forbear and said they were his neighbours and should be his friends and were his enemies. . . . And partly by his importunity and refusal and partly by the entreaty of one Beckwith that came

with them, they let this examinat and his brethren alone. But they took against this examinat's will certain of his friends with them."

The following day the abbot fled to Bolton Castle to Lord Scrope, where he remained until the insurgents were "broken at Richmond," when he returned home. "Since that time," he says, "he heard nothing of the matter. And other comfort aid or assistance he gave not them by word deed or writing by the virtue of his oath and upon his allegiance."

Lastly, as to the special points upon which Staveley accused him, he denied "utterly that ever he sent or caused to be sent, nor that he was privy that any messenger should be sent to Sir Thomas Percy, or that he put his servants and tenants with Staveley or gave them any aid or comfort, or that he sent any man to lie in Lincolnshire to consider the state of the country there, but saith that the cellarer of the house sent one Jackson to Lincolnshire at the latter end of the Christmas holidays to gather their rents and for no other purpose to this examinat's knowledge as he saith."*

The quondam abbot of Fountains, William Thirsk, was implicated in the movement,† together with the abbot of Jervaulx. Thirsk had been deprived of his office at Fountains by Crumwell's visitors in the beginning of the year 1536. Layton and Legh had written to Crumwell about his having made away

* Chapter House Bk., A. $\frac{2}{25}$, pp. 259 to 263.

† *Ibid.*, B. $\frac{2}{11}$, p. 101.

with the plate and jewels of the abbey, and of their success in getting him to "resign privately into their hands."* On the appointment of his successor, Marmaduke Bradley, who had offered Crumwell six hundred marks, and the king £1,000 as "first-fruits" if he could obtain the office, he retired first to London and afterwards to Jervaulx. How far he had any part in the insurrection for which he was executed must be judged from his examination as there is little else known about him. On April the 24th doctors Layton and Legh, his old enemies, had him before them in the Tower, and, being sworn, he said: "About the beginning of the last Lent (1537) as this examinat was in his chamber at Jervaulx abbey came to him one of the servants of the house, called James Thwaites, desiring this examinat in the abbot of Jervaulx's name to deliver to Middleton that came with him forty pence; one Staveley being there also. And he said he would, and with that took out an angel noble and bade them change it. And Staveley took the same in his

* See Vol. i., p. 336. Layton and Legh, the king's commissaries, accepted the resignation of William Thirsk in "The Church Chamber," at the monastery of St. Mary's Fountains, 19 January, 1536. They granted him a pension of 100 marks a year (Calend. x., No. 131.) In a letter written by his successor on March 6th it appears that there were considerable difficulties about the money arrangements. The pension of £40 was objected to as excessive, and Thirsk is said to want to keep all the house goods above the value of £1,000 (No. 424), and according to archbishop Lee he had not resigned by the end of March, as he wished to be made secure as to his proper and promised pension (No. 521).

hands and said it was cracked. Then this examinat took out another angel and bade them change that. And the said Staveley took both and put them up, saying, 'Ye churle monks ye have too much and we have nothing. Neither of these thou gettest again.' Then this examinat said again, 'Ye shall not have my money so. If ye be true men ye will not take my money away. Ye should have but forty pence of me.' Middleton, however, promised to repay the money if Staveley did not, 'and so they departed without any more words.'"

About a week after this "the said Middleton and Staveley in harness came to the said abbot of Jervaulx as he and this examinat were in his chamber, and bade the said abbot and this examinat upon pain of death and all their brethren and servants go with them forthwith. And many other of the commons were in the hall and about the house. And he desired them instantly to suffer him and his brethren to be still, seeing it was not meet that religious men should go about any such business. And so this examinat desired them also to let him likewise alone for he was old and feeble and nothing meet for such business. Nevertheless as this examinat heard say they took with them the servants of the house but whether it were by the abbot's command or not he cannot tell."

Further he denied absolutely that he had ever desired Staveley or any other "if there should be any new insurrection . . . 'to help to put him in his

room again.'” And he declared he knew nothing of the first rising, “being in London all the time,” and never heard of any message being sent to Sir Thomas Percy.*

If the abbots of Jervaulx and Fountains do not appear to have afforded active assistance to the insurgents, the part played by the abbot of Whalley was of a still less compromising nature. William Rede, a baker of Oxford, said that he had carried letters from the abbot “to his scholars being in Oxford,” and also “another to the abbot of Hayles.” The abbot had told him to recommend him specially “to the abbot of Hayles and tell him that I am sore stopped and acrazed. And pray him to send me word when he purposeth to come over to this country, for I would be glad to see him once ere I depart out of this world, seeing I brought him up here from a child.” The baker on his way received a packet of letters from a schoolmaster to give to “Philip, his son, at Oriel college.” And when he came to Wotton, having told the constable there what he was carrying, he found himself carried off to Kenilworth castle. The letters were examined, and as far as can be judged from the document, only implicated the schoolmaster and not the abbot.†

One witness, indeed, declared that the abbot of Whalley lent a horse to Nicholas Tempest, of Bracewell. But Tempest's account of the matter is very

* Chapter House Bk., A. $\frac{2}{26}$, pp. 257, 258.

† Chapter House Bk., A. $\frac{1}{29}$, p. 134.

different. He says that he went to the abbey "with three or four hundred men," and "being kept out about two hours were at last let in for fear of burning their barns and houses. And there this examinat swore the abbot and about eight of his religion according to Aske's oath."* So that even the oath of the pilgrims was extorted from the monks by threats of violence. The only other matter which appears against Whalley is that lord Darcy had some communication with the abbey. "Memorandum," it is noted, "also that lord Darcy this Lent last past sent a copy of a letter which my lord of Norfolk wrote to him unto the prior of Whalley who is now attainted of high treason, whereby appeareth that the lord Darcy favoured the said prior, being a traitor."†

Lastly, the only item of information about Bridlington is obtained in a note possibly in Crumwell's hand. "Item," it runs, "the prior of Bridlington and Dr. Pickering, the friar, had been great setters forth of both the first and last insurrections. And the said Dr. Pickering, a great writer of letters, to move and stir as well the first as the last. And also the prior of Bridlington had in readiness as well all his household servants as also divers his tenants in harness, for to have given assistance to Bygod and Lumley in the last insurrection."‡ In a list of those implicated the names of "Nicholas Tempest, Ham-

* R. O. State Papers, Dom., 1537, 7.

† Chapter House Bk., A. 25, p. 247, *i.e.* the lord Darcy being the traitor.

‡ Chapter House Bk., B. 21, p. 143.

merton and Pickering, friar," are associated with that of "the abbot of Bridlington." These four names have been subsequently erased. Against the names of Hammerton and Tempest is the note: "The petition made to Thomas Percy by the abbot of Sawley, wherein is no apparent matter against them but before the pardon."* And even as to this Nicholas Tempest denied upon oath that he knew anything about that "supplication," his connection with Sawley abbey being confined to advising the abbot's chaplain to lay their cause before the meeting at Pomfret, and "when the commons had put in the abbots and monks," giving "them a fat ox, one mutton, and two or three geese."† In like manner Sir Stephen Hammerton denied having had anything to do in the matter. His declaration is of interest, as it shows that the abbot of Sawley and doubtless some of his brethren expiated their crime of taking possession of their old home on the scaffold. "And he saith," runs the record of Hammerton's examination, "that the abbot of Sawley, as he was condemned to die, sent divers persons to this examinat to desire his forgiveness for that he had named this examinat in the said letters . . . and he took it upon his death that neither this examinat nor no other gent or other person of the county was counsel to the making or devising of the said supplication but only he himself and the said Estgate (his chaplain)

* *Ibid.*, p. 101.

† R. O. State Papers, Dom., 1537, T. 3*.

and two of his said brethren called Bradford and Parish."*

The punishment meted out to the insurgents now that the last resistance was at an end was, as might be expected, not wanting in severity. Seventy-four of those who had been taken in the unsuccessful attack upon Carlisle were hanged by Norfolk from the walls of the city.†

The chief prisoners were first tried by a commission in York. In forcing friends and even relations of the prisoners to take part as jurors in this trial Norfolk perpetrated a cruelty which could hardly have been believed as intentional were it not for the testimony of his own letter to Crumwell. After telling him that the king's commission had arrived "with two books of indictments and two schedules; the one of such as should be indicted and the other of gentlemen to be impanelled," he goes on to say: "I doubt not to have the greatest appearance that was seen at York of many years, on Tuesday night and Wednesday morning (May 9th, 1537). I will sit upon those that be named in the schedule on Wednesday by nine o'clock, and also upon two

* Chapter House Bk., A. $\frac{2}{28}$, p. 30. The "Monasticon," v., p. 511, says that William Trafford, last abbot of Salley, was hanged at Lancaster for opposition to the crown in 1538. The declaration of Hammerton, made in 1537, states that he was condemned to death, and it would seem to imply that he had already been executed. Walcott says his execution was at Lancaster on March 10th, 1537, and this is the year assigned by Stowe (ed. 1615, p. 573), who says that "one Astlebe, a monk of Jervaulx," was executed with him.

† Hall, p. 824.

monks of the Charterhouse for not knowing of the king to be supreme head of the Church, unless they do openly recant from their false opinion which I think they will not do.”*

The duke then goes on to say that he thinks it well, as he presumes Crumwell intends, to have “two divers inquests; for they being so kept that one of them shall not know what another doth shall make them the more quick to find the matter. And I have so provided that we shall lack no number if I would have four inquests. And I am at this time of such acquaintance with the gentlemen that I dare well adventure to put divers on the quests (of whom) some hath married with the lord Darcy’s daughters and some with Sir Robert Constable’s.† And I will put John Aske thereupon, who is eldest brother to Robert Aske. Doubt ye not, my lord, but the matter shall be found according to the king’s pleasure.”

Continuing, he says he hopes to have the evidence before Thursday, which “is no day to sit considering

* The names of these two were “John Rochester and James Walwercke,” two of the heroic members of the London Charterhouse. They were hanged in chains at York. *Vide* Vol. i., p. 240.

† Raine, “Hexham” i., App. clxii., *note*, says, “These were Brian Stapleton, of Carlton; Henry Babington, of Dethick; Sir William Fairfax, of Gilling; Sir Thomas Dawney, of Cowick; and Sir Thomas Metham. Sir Thomas Metham was a grand juror.

Sir Robert Constable’s daughters married into the houses of St. Quintin, Gower, Pudsey, Cholmeley, and Husee: Sir Roger Cholmeley and Sir Edward Gower were on the York grand jury.

it shall be Ascension day," and if so "Crumwell shall have the result and be able to proceed with the London arraignments on Monday or Tuesday. My good lord," he goes on, "I will not spare to put the best friends these men have upon one of the inquests, to prove their affection whether they will rather serve his majesty truly and frankly in this matter, or else to favour their friends, and if they will not find, then they may have thanks according to their cankered hearts. And, as for the other inquest, I will appoint such that I shall no more doubt of than of myself."*

The commission was held at York Castle on "Wednesday, the vigil of the Ascension May 9th," before the duke of Norfolk, Sir Thomas Tempest and others. The jury, amongst whom was John Aske, the brother of Robert, found the prisoners guilty of conspiring with lord Darcy on the 10th of October "to deprive the king of his dignity, title, name, and royal state, namely, of being on earth the supreme head of the English Church." Also they found them guilty of endeavouring to compel the king "to summon and hold a parliament and convocation and other divers high treasons." Further, that having been pardoned they repeated these treasons in January.

A week later they were brought up before chancellor Audeley at Westminster, and pleading not guilty, May 24th was appointed for the trial.

* Raine's "Hexham Priory," i., App. clxi.

On that day all the prisoners except Ralph Bulmer* were condemned to death.†

There can be no doubt that the abbots and monks now tried and put to death fell victims to Henry's cupidity and sanguinary vengeance, and that they did not suffer for their own misdeeds. Among the rest the following religious were ordered to be executed: Adam Sedbar, abbot of Jervaulx; William Thirsk, quondam abbot of Fountains; William Wood, prior of Bridlington; James Cockerel, prior of Gisborough and rector of Lythe; and John Pickering, late of Bridlington, and a friar of the Dominican Order. Lord Darcy was executed on Tower Hill. The abbots, with Percy, Bygod, John Bulmer, Hammerton, Lumley, and Tempest, were hanged and quartered at Tyburn, while Constable and Aske were hanged in chains at Hull and York. The fate of those who had withstood the royal will and appealed even to arms to save the ancient abbeys of England from spoliation and to protest against the changes in religious faith and practice imposed upon an unwilling nation, struck terror into the hearts of the English people. The collapse of the movement removed every restraint upon the autocratic power of the crown and opened the way for further and more extensive suppressions of religious houses and seizure of monastic and church property.

* *Coram Rege*. Roll, 33 Hen. VIII., Easter, M. 9. Ralph, son of Sir John Bulmer, by a letter dated 29 Jan., A^o 32 Hen. VIII., was pardoned and discharged.

† *Ibid.* and *Baga de Secretis*, in iii. Rept. Dept. Keeper, App. ii.

CHAPTER V.

DISSOLUTION BY ATTAINDER.

THE Northern disturbances, in the autumn of 1536 and the spring of the following year, acted as a check upon the suppression schemes of Henry. From Michaelmas of the former to the same feast in the latter year, according to the accounts of his ministers, very few religious houses passed into his possession. In Yorkshire and the adjoining counties the spring months of 1537 were used by the royal officers in once more ejecting the monks and nuns who had been reinstated by the insurgents in their old homes. The king's instructions to the duke of Norfolk on this point were precise. He was immediately after the execution of Constable and Aske to restore the keeping of the monasteries formerly suppressed to the royal farmers, "and aid such commissioners as his majesty shall appoint to dissolve the other monasteries within the limit of the said act not yet dissolved." Further, the instructions run, "the said duke shall cause all the religious persons that were or be in any of the said houses either to take their livings in such other monasteries of their religion as they shall be assigned to, or else if they shall refuse so to do, he shall punish them as vagabonds and enemies of

the commonwealth, so as no one of that sort remain at large in that country."

Norfolk and the earl of Sussex had, indeed, in behalf of the king, made large promises at the meeting of Doncaster that the restored religious should be left undisturbed until the Northern parliament had finally settled the question of the dissolution. But the king evidently did not consider himself bound by the acts of his plenipotentiaries. "And, forasmuch," his instructions continue, "as the said duke of Norfolk and the lord admiral at their late being at Doncaster promised to be suitors to the king's majesty that the monks, canons, and nuns of such religious houses suppressed should have *victum* and *vestitum* of the goods of the monasteries they were of, till further determination should be taken touching that matter, by reason whereof some ringleaders may perchance make some argument for the continuance of the said monks, nuns and canons with such sustentation at their liberties, the said duke in such case shall make a discourse to all men appearing so much affectionate towards them, of their essential wilful poverty, chastity and obedience, and dilate how far they vary from good religious men, from them that will be wilfully poor; yea, from true subjects that would direct their prince and sovereign lord; that will not live but as they list themselves, and therewith declare how the king's majesty is by his laws rightfully entitled to those monasteries, and that those

that will so direct his majesty therein be not esteemed for his great true subjects, but to be punished as his traitors and rebels.”*

In a previous letter, written by Henry at the time when the duke had proclaimed martial law, the commander had been praised for the way he had “discreetly, plainly and truly” painted and set forth to the people in their true colours “those persons that call themselves religious.” “And we doubt not,” continues the king, “but the further you shall wade in the investigation of their behaviours the more ye shall detect the great number of them and the less esteem the punishment of such, as you shall find, in will or deed, culpable in things that may touch us or the common quiet of our realm. . . .”

“Thirdly,” the letter continues, “We do right well approve and allow your proceedings in the displaying of our banner. And forasmuch as the same is now spread and displayed, by reason whereof, till the same shall be closed again, the course of our laws must give place to the ordinances and estates martial, our pleasure is, that, before you shall close up our said banner again, you shall in any wise cause such dreadful execution to be done upon a good number of the inhabitants of every town, village and hamlet, that have offended in this rebellion, as well by the hanging of them up in trees, as by the quartering of them and the setting of their heads and quarters in every town, great and

* Chapter House Bk., A. $\frac{2}{26}$, pp. 367 *et seq.*

small, and in all such other places, as they may be a fearful spectacle to all other hereafter that would practice any like matter: which we require you to do, without pity or respect, according to our former letters; remembering that it shall be much better, that these traitors should perish in their wilful, unkind and traitorous follies, than that so slender punishment should be done upon them, as the dread thereof should not be a warning to others." Further, Henry expressed his desire that after "such execution" had been done by the summary processes of martial law, the ordinary legal forms of "ordinary justice" should, at the duke's discretion, complete the work of punishment.

"Finally," the letter concludes, "forasmuch as all these troubles have ensued by the solicitation and traitorous conspiracies of the monks and canons of those parts; we desire and pray you, at your repair to Sawley,* Hexham,† Newminster,‡ Lenercost,§ Saint Agathas|| and all such other places as have made any manner of resistance, or in any wise conspired or kept their houses with any force since the appointment at Doncaster, you shall without pity or circumstance, now that our banner is displayed, cause all the monks and canons that be in any wise faulty to be tied up without further delay or ceremony to the terrible example of others."¶

* In Craven, West Riding.

† In Northumberland.

‡ In the same county.

§ In Cumberland.

|| At Richmond, Yorks.

¶ State Papers, i., 537.

The rigours of martial law are only by chance recorded, and it is impossible to calculate the numbers of religious, and of the people who rose to defend them, that perished during the months when legal trial was suspended in the north and Sussex and Norfolk acted upon the royal command "to cause all the monks and canons that be in any wise faulty to be tied up without further delay or ceremony." And even when Sussex stayed his hand in compassion, Henry would hear of no pleading for those who had offended against his majesty. "Concerning the old man," he writes, "whom you wrote you had respited, upon the lamentation he made at the bar and the allegation of his service thrice heretofore against the Scots and otherwise done unto us; albeit we cannot but take your stay of him in good part, yet, considering he hath so often received our wages and would nevertheless at the last be thus corrupted against us, we think him for an example more worthy to suffer, than the rest that before had not experience of our princely puissance, nor had received any benefit of us; and so remit him unto you to be executed according to his judgment."*

In some instances, however, the feeling of the people, even in this reign of terror, was manifested against the cruelties perpetrated, by the secret removal of the bodies of those who suffered, from the gallows or trees on which they were left

* State Papers, i., p. 541.

hanging. The duke of Norfolk was urged to make inquiries and vigorously punish those who had been bold enough to do even this act of Christian charity. In reply he denied all knowledge of the matter. "You wish to know," he writes to Crumwell, "whether such persons as were put to execution in Westmoreland and Cumberland were taken down and buried by my commandment or not. Undoubtedly, my good lord, if I had consented thereunto I would I had hanged by them." In conclusion, he blames the earl of Cumberland for not having had the bodies hanged in chains as he had directed, and when they had been removed, not making more vigorous "search, who hath so highly offended his majesty." He adds: "in this shire (York) and the bishoprick they all hang still in chains, notwithstanding that I have had no small intercession for many of them."* The king appears strangely anxious that the perpetrators of the act should be discovered and brought to justice. "And," writes Crumwell, "as concerning the depositions of certain women, anent the cutting down and burial of the traitors . . . surely having regard and respect to the evil example and perverse minds of the offenders, which is thought can only (come) of women's heads (although) some men were the principal offenders," the king thinks they certainly ought to be found and punished as they so well deserved.†

* Raine's "Hexham Priory," i., App. clxi.

† State Papers, Dom., 1537, $\frac{v}{24}$.

Under the terror of the royal vengeance and with the example of these remorseless punishments inflicted on all who came within reach of the royal arm, the commissioners do not appear to have experienced much difficulty in regaining possession of the confiscated monasteries. At the beginning of February Norfolk had anticipated a very different result, and declared that, although the nobles and gentry had promised "to put the king's farmers in possession of the religious houses," no one would dare to do so.* But a couple of months later, what with the executions actually carried out, and the dread each one had of being involved in the same fate, resistance was at end. A correspondent writing to reassure Dr. Legh, the royal visitor whose punishment had been demanded by the Pilgrims of Grace, says on April 24th: "Loving to God, the country is quiet enough, saving that every malefactor dreads himself. . . . And as concerning any complaint against you or other for the visitation, there is nothing spoken of that matter. I dare well say there is no religious man that will avow any grief for that matter."†

According to the directions given by the king to his generals, the monasteries of Sawley, Hexham, Newminster, Lanercost and St. Agatha's were quickly retaken from the monks. Of Sawley sufficient has already been said, and the resistance experienced by the king's officers at Hexham has been described. On the 5th of March, 1537, the

* State Papers, i., 534.

† R. O. State Papers, Dom., 1537, 5.

latter monastery passed into the duke of Norfolk's hands. Plate to the value of £68 9s., and weighing 359 ounces, was taken for the king, but on the very night of the suppression day a great deal of the monastic moveables was carried away by the people of the town.* One only member of the monastery, prior Jay, who had apparently taken no part in the resistance, received a pension. The previous day, the 4th of March, Norfolk was at Lanercost, and, as the record has it, "expelled the prior, convent, and familiars from their possessions and took them into the king's hands." †

Newminster, another monastery specially noted by the king, was finally suppressed on August 20th, after the commissioners had been there from July 1st. The value of the moveables was counted at close upon a thousand pounds; more than one-half of which was represented by the lead and the worth of 660 ounces of plate. Pensions were promised to the community, consisting of seventeen priests, three junior monks, as well as to four choir boys; ‡ but the following year only the abbot, Edward Tirry, and a former abbot, Edward Dunfield, received anything. § The suppression of St. Agatha's, Richmond, followed about the same time; one only, Robert Brampton, receiving any pension. The goods and plate were valued at close upon £1,000, and some rich vestments from St. Agatha's and Calder were

* Exch. Aug. Off. Mins. Accts., 27-28 H. VIII., 200, m. 4.

† *Ibid.*, m. 3d. ‡ *Ibid.*, m. 4d. § *Ibid.*, 29-30 H. VIII., No. 204, m. 1d.

handed to Sir Thomas Pope for the king's use. Much of the property was, however, seized by the insurgents during the northern rising, as it still remained in the possession of the receiver, and some was not recovered* for the royal purse.

A similar devastation of goods occurred at Lambley, a convent of Benedictine nuns on the Tyne in Northumberland. The royal receiver reported that there was absolutely nothing of value left when he arrived at the place to suppress it. All the moveables and domestic utensils, as well as the plate and lead, had disappeared. Even the "nuns had fled, leaving neither goods nor cattle" behind them.†

Several of the larger monasteries fell into the royal power at this time by the attainder of their abbots. In the statute for the settlement of the royal succession (25 Hen. VIII., c. 22), under the ambiguous terms "estate of inheritance" and "successors," were introduced two great changes into English law. By the first, estates tail were made forfeitable for treason, and the second—"other than such persons as shall have been so convict, their heirs and *successors*"—may have been intended, as is suggested by Sir Matthew Hale, to fasten upon lands held in the right of a corporation as by a bishop or abbot. The king had a personal concern in all property so confiscated, and it was to his interest to make the meaning of the act as wide as

* *Ibid.*, No. 169, m. 5.

† *Ibid.*, 28-29 Hen. VIII., No. 200, m. 2d.

possible. Hitherto the attainder of a bishop or abbot would not affect the property of the diocese or abbey over which the attainted superior ruled. It was left to Henry to include the forfeiture of possessions of a corporation in the punishment awarded to the head for supposed or real treasonable practices. Burnet argues that such a proceeding was unjustifiable. "How justly soever these abbots were attainted," he writes, "the seizing on their abbey lands, pursuant to those attainders, was thought a great stretch of law, since the offence of an ecclesiastical incumbent is a personal thing, and cannot prejudice the church; no more than a secular man, being in office, does by being attainted bring any diminution of the rights of the office on his successors."*

However, upon this interpretation of the law of treason Henry now determined to act, and the supposed complicity of some of the abbots in the pilgrimage of grace gave him the opportunity of laying hands upon the possessions of their houses. The part taken by John Paslew, abbot of Whalley, has already been remarked upon. According to the evidence there was very little which could be construed into active co-operation with the insurgents. Still it appears that he was tried at Lancaster, probably by martial law, together with two of his monks, John Eastgate and William Haydock, and the abbot of Sawley. William Trafford, the abbot of Sawley, was hanged at Lancaster on March 10th,

* "Hist. of Reformat.," ed. 1679, Bk. iii., p. 240.

and the abbot of Whalley, with Eastgate, two days later at Whalley. The other monk of Whalley suffered the same punishment the following day, March 13th, in a field some miles from his monastery, where his body was left hanging for some time.*

Writing to the earl of Sussex about this time, Henry conveys his thanks for the punishment inflicted upon those who had offended him. "And whereas," he continues, "upon the execution of the abbot of Whalley, you have taken order for the good direction of the house, and the safe keeping of the goods without embezzlement, till further knowledge of our pleasure; approving much your good foresight thereof, we have thought convenient to signify unto you, that forasmuch as it appeareth that the house of Whalley hath been so sore corrupt amongst others, that it should seem there remaineth very few therein that were meet to remain and continue in such a corporation, we think it shall be meet that some order be taken for the remotion of the monks now being in the same. And that (it is proper) we should take the whole house into our own hands; as, by our laws, we be justly, by the attainder of the said late abbot entitled unto it; and so devise for such a new establishment thereof, as

* Whittaker's "Hist. of Whalley," p. 123. The actual date seems uncertain. From the king's letter to Sussex it would seem that the abbot of Whalley was dead before Sussex wrote letters which Henry speaks of receiving on March 11th. State Papers, i., p. 540.

shall be thought meet for the honour of God, our surety and the benefit of the country. Wherefore our pleasure is, that you shall, with good dexterity, lay unto the charges of all the monks there, their grievous offences towards us and our commonwealth and therewith assay their minds, whether they will conform themselves gladly." They may either go to other houses or "receive secular habit," but Sussex is enjoined to endeavour to get them to go to some other monastery, as, says the king, "it cannot be wholesome for our commonwealth to permit them to wander abroad."*

The directions of Henry were acted upon, and by Michaelmas, 1537, John Kechin, the receiver, had sold goods and got in rents to the value of £957 11s. 7d. from the abbey of Whalley, and had sent up to Brian Tuke, the king's treasurer, some £500.† Thus in a few months the king had apparently given up all idea of "devising the new establishment" which was to be more "meet for the honour of God and the benefit of the country" than the old monastery of Whalley. Perhaps, however, he considered that by filling the royal purse he was but carrying out his original idea of "honouring God" and benefiting the country.

In the same way the abbeys of Barlings, Jervaulx and Kirksted, and the priory of Bridlington, came at this time under the law of attainder. Bishop

* State Papers, i., p. 540.

† Exch. A. O. Rec. Gen. Accts., 28-29 Hen. VIII., No. 211.

Mackarel, the abbot of Barlings, was executed in March. His supposed offences have already been spoken of, and his monastery shared the fate of Whalley. The minster church, which was 300 feet in length, was defaced, the lead on the buildings both here and at Kirksted being torn from the roofs and melted down at the special direction of Crumwell.*

Bridlington, an important priory of Austin canons in Yorkshire, possessing an income of £547 a year, likewise came to Henry by the attainder and execution of the prior. The previous year Crumwell had pressed the house to recognize the king as founder, a request which the community refused.† By Michaelmas, 1537, the sales of the monastic property had been conducted by Tristram Teshe, the royal receiver for the district, and had realized more than £800. The monks had been ejected some months before, and in May, Crumwell had written to the duke of Norfolk of the king's intention to look after the interest of the poor people round about Jervaulx and Bridlington. He thought of trying to get "some substantial person meet and necessary to stay the country and keep hospitality, to dwell in the principal part of the monastery," and thus in some measure to keep up the traditions of the place.‡ The Bridlington people had petitioned that the church, and particularly the shrine of St. John of Bridlington, might be kept and not defaced.§

* R. O. State Papers, Dom., 1537, $\frac{7}{281}$.

† Wright, 80.

‡ R. O. State Papers, Dom., 1537, $\frac{7}{24}$.

§ *Ibid.*, $\frac{7}{270}$.

The early English choir of five bays had an east end like those of Whitby and Rievaulx. The altar possessed a magnificent reredos, and between it and a chapel aisle with five altars stood the shrine of the saint* from which the people begged the king would restrain his hand. But Henry had a scruple. "As for the shrine," Crumwell says in the letter to Norfolk already quoted, "the king's highness, to the intent that his people should not be seduced in the offering of their money, his grace would have taken down, which and all other jewels and plate appertaining to his highness, except such as you desire to have for your money" are to be sent to him. The vestments, he adds, and other goods not fit for the royal use are to be sold.† The actual demolition, however, did not take place till a few months later. Richard Bellasis, who had been engaged in this work for the king, wrote in November that he would delay the destruction till March "because the days now are so short." But, he added, "from such time as I begin I trust shortly to dispatch it, after such fashion, that when all is finished, I trust your lordship shall think that I have been no evil husband in all such things as your lordship hath appointed me to do."‡ The nave of ten bays with its aisles, which alone remain to this day, indicates the faithful way in which this agent of destruction kept his promise to Crumwell.

* Walcott, "Eng. Minsters," ii., p. 77.

† R. O. State Papers, Dom., 1537, 24. ‡ Wright, p. 165.

The people of the neighbourhood might well petition for the safety of the priory, for the poor of the district annually received in alms from the benefactions left in trust to the religious more than £250 of our money. The four priests and four deacons who served the parish church of Scarborough received a yearly stipend from the funds of the monastery,* while more than one aged priest found an asylum within its walls.†

The neighbouring abbey of Jervaulx, situated in the vale of the Ure, fell likewise in consequence of the insurrection. Adam Sedbar, the abbot, was hanged, and his brethren were soon turned out of their monastery. "The house of Jervaulx," wrote the king with keen prevision to the earl of Sussex, shortly after the death of the abbot, "is in some danger of suppression by like offence as hath been committed at Whalley,"‡ and the danger was not long delayed. At the beginning of June, Sir Arthur Darcy informed Crumwell that he had been "at the suppression. . . . The houses within the gate are covered wholly with lead, and there is one of the fairest churches that I have seen." In fact, he was so delighted with the place, that he suggested it would make a good stable for the royal "stud of mares," which were so costly to the king, "at Thornbury and other places."§

* Valor Eccl., p. 120.

† An example of a corrody at Bridlington will be found in the Appendix.

‡ State Papers, i., 542.

§ Wright, p. 158.

By the middle of November, what Darcy declared to be "one of the fairest churches I have ever seen" had been desecrated and demolished through the energetic action of Richard Bellasis. Crumwell had ordered the lead to be taken from the roof, and his officer wrote to say, that he had "taken all the lead of Jervaulx and made it in pieces of half foddors, which lead amounteth to the number of eighteen score and five foddors, with thirty-four foddors and a half that were there before. The said lead cannot be conveyed nor carried until the next summer, for the ways in that country are so foul and deep that no carriage can pass in winter. And as concerning the razing and taking down the house, if it be your lordship's pleasure I am minded to let it stand to the spring of the year, because the days are now so short, it would be double charges to do it now." As to the bells, "I can," he says, "get only fifteen shillings a hundredweight" for them, and would gladly know whether I shall take the price "or send them up to London."*

By Michaelmas, 1537, the king's officer was able to account for receipts from the attainted monastery of Jervaulx exceeding £600, or more than £6,000 of our money. The following year the same property brought to the exchequer £764 13s. 8d., but in the same year nearly £2,000 was paid out of this and the proceeds of other attainted monastic property in Yorkshire, for the fees and payments of knights and

* Wright, 164.

squires on the marches of Scotland,* and thus only indirectly benefited the king.

The great abbey of Furness, in Lancashire, was also now induced to surrender to Henry. Roger Pyle, the abbot, and some of his monks, were thought to be incriminated with the northern insurgents. The members of the community, "with the tenants and servants, were successfully examined in private."† The result was summed up in a bill of accusations against some members of the abbey. The abbot had been guilty of "falsehood at the time of the visitation in causing his monks to be foresworn." The monks of Sawley, on the suppression of that monastery, had been sent to Furness, and the abbot had induced them to go back to their monastery during the rebellion. "The abbot concealed the treason of Henry Sawley, monk, who said, no secular knave should be head of the Church; which abbot also made suit to his brethren to hold with him in all things that should be laid to his charge, promising to be for the same good unto them." These were the accusations of a friar named Robert Legat. A priest named Roger Pele, vicar of Dalton, said that the abbot did not keep the king's injunctions; and one of his monks, John Broughton, added that he knew of the prophecies of the Holy Maid of Kent and others. One of the abbey bailiffs said that the abbot had told the

* Exch. Augt. Offic. Mins. Accts., 29-30 Hen. VIII., 214, f. 18.

† Lingard, vi., 339.

brethren to be of good heart, "for he was sure n
 both sides both for the king and the commons." "
 And a tenant said that he had ordered the monks to
 do the best for the commons, "which," runs the
 document, "the abbot in his confession doth flat
 deny."

As regards the monks, the prior, Brian Garner, and one of the seniors, John Groyn, were reported as assembling their tenants on "All Hallows" Eve, when the latter said that "the king should make no more abbots there, but they would choose them themselves." Another monk had spoken against the king as rightful possessor of the crown of England, while others had said that "the bishop of Rome was unjustly put down."*

The result of the examination at Furness was communicated to Henry by the earl of Sussex. Sufficient matter had been reported against the abbot to have secured his sharing the fate of the abbots of Whalley and Sawley, and the passing of the monastery to the king by his attainder. Sussex, however, hit upon another plan. "By such examinations as you have sent us," wrote the king to him, "it appeareth that the abbot of Furness and divers of his monks have not been of that truth towards us, that to their duties appertained. We desire and pray you (therefore) with all the dexterity you can, to devise and excogitate to use all the means to you possible, to ensearch and try out the very truth of

* West's "Antiq. of Furness," 165.

their proceedings, and with whom they, or any of them have had any intelligence. We think verily, that you shall find thereby such matter as shall show the light of many things yet unknown. And our pleasure is, that you shall, upon a further examination, commit the said abbot and such of his monks as you shall suspect to have been offenders to ward; there to remain till you shall, upon the signification unto us of such other things as by your wisdom you shall try out, know further our pleasure.”*

In reply to this communication Sussex wrote on the sixth of April that he had in his previous examination at Furness used “the said abbot and his brethren, in such wise, as . . . it was impossible to get any more than was had before” out of them. He told the king that he “had committed to ward and sure custody, in your castle of Lancaster, two of the same monks,† which was all we could find faulty.” Seeing, therefore, it was not likely that any “material thing” done “after the pardon,” would be discovered against the abbot and his monks “that would serve for the purpose,” the earl now exposed his plan for obtaining the rich possessions of the abbey for the king. “I, the said earl,” he says, “devising with myself, if one way would not serve, how, and by what other means, the said monks might be rid from the said abbey, and consequently

* State Papers, i., 541.

† Henry Sawley was apparently one of these, as his name does not appear on the deed of surrender.

how the same might be at your gracious pleasure, caused the said abbot to be sent for to Whalley and thereupon, after we had examined him, and indeed could not perceive that it was possible for us to have any other matter, I, the same earl, as before by the advice of other of your council, determined to essay him as of myself, whether he would be contented to surrender, give and grant, unto your heirs and assigns the said monastery."*

With the fate of his brother abbots brought so clearly before his mind, and with the bodies of abbot Paslew and his companions still perhaps swinging before the gate of Whalley where this examination was conducted, it is scarcely a matter of surprise that Sussex carried his point. It was a choice between death or surrender. In either case the royal hand would seize the coveted possessions, and as Sussex so clearly said, "the monks would be rid from the abbey, and the same at" the king's gracious pleasure. The abbot chose the course most in accord with the weakness of human nature. He saved his life, but at the cost of his honour and his house. On the 5th of April, 1537, in the presence of Sussex and others, he signed a paper surrendering the monastery to the king on account of the "misorder and evil lives, both unto God and our prince, of the brethren of the said monastery,"† "not doubting," as the earl continues, "but that we and he together shall easily obtain the ratification

* West's "Antiq. of Furness," p. 166.

† Wright, 153.

of the same gift of the convent, under their convent seal, as shall be requested."

Immediately this document had been obtained from the abbot of Furness three knights were despatched from Whalley "to take into their hands, rule and governance the said house to the use of your highness and to see that the monks and servants of the same be kept in due order and nothing to be embezzled." Sussex was evidently pleased with what he had done, and as he informed Henry, Fitzherbert, to whom he unfolded his plan, "liked the same very well, saying, that he thought it was the most convenient way that could be, to conduct that monastery to your grace's hands and that now they may be ousted." Fitzherbert drew up the deed of surrender ready for the monks' signatures which the earl proposed to demand a few days later.*

On the following Monday, therefore, which was April 9th, the commissioners arrived with the abbot, and the deed prepared by Anthony Fitzherbert having been read to the community in their Chapter House, they took the only possible course left for them and ratified the act of their abbot. Thirty monks out of the thirty-three named as the community by Sussex signed away their rights; two were in prison; only one apparently did not affix his name to the instrument.†

None of the monks, it seems, received any pension in return for their surrender of a monastery worth,

* West, *ut sup.*

† Eighth Rept. Dep. Keeper App., ii., 21.

free of all charge, more than £800 a year. All they had of their own on being turned out into the world was forty shillings each, except three of the thirty-one, "which being sick and impotent" were given sixty.* Abbot Roger, a year later, was provided for by the king granting him for life the profits of the rectory of Dalton, which were then valued at £33 6s. 8d. a year.† Apparently he lived in the parsonage, for he was directed by Crumwell to give it up to "John Bothe one of the king's servants." In reply, which he dates from Furness, he pleads that he has "nothing else to live upon," and adds, "but for your displeasure I should be there now." To propitiate the all-powerful minister he sends him forty shillings in gold, and promises to send as much more at Easter.‡

"The vast and magnificent edifice of Furness was forsaken," writes canon Dixon, "the lamp of the altar of St. Mary went out for ever; and in the deserted cloisters no sound was heard but the axe and hammer of those who came to cut away the lead, dash down the bells, hew away the rafters and break in pieces the arches and pillars. Thus dismantled, the ruin was left as a common quarry, for the convenience of every countryman who could cart away the sculptured stones for building a pigsty or a byre."§

* Exch. Augt. Off. Mins. Accts., 29-30 Hen. VIII., No. 187, mm. 13-14.

† West, p. 190.

‡ R. O. Crumwell Corresp., viii., f. 18. § I., 496.

The sales of the monastic goods realized the great sum of close upon £800, and bands of imported workmen were employed in the work of destruction. "Also," says the account, "paid to divers and sundry labourers and artificers hired, as well for taking down of the lead of the said monastery, with costs of melting and casting the same, as for pulling down of the church, steeple and other 'housing' of the said monastery, with emption and provision of ropes and other engines occupied about the same £70 4s. 9d."*

Here as elsewhere the suppression was felt most keenly by the poor. From "time immemorial" on Maunday Thursday alms had been liberally bestowed to the poor at the abbey gate, while a hundred poor boys in the cloister each received a sum equal to more than a shilling of our money. Yearly on the feast of St. Crispin, according to the will of the founder, five oxen were given to the poor of the neighbourhood with a request for prayers for his soul. "Each week eight widows" had their bread and beer at the monastic kitchen, while from the foundation of the abbey to the day of dissolution thirteen poor people had been entirely maintained within its walls. Thus the regular charities alone, for which the monks of Furness were the trustees, amounted to a yearly sum of nearly £500 of our money.† This loss to the poor of the neighbourhood, even if no account is taken of the numerous other services

* Exch. Augt. Off., *ut sup.*

† Valor Eccl., v., 270.

done to them under no strict obligation of justice, may be well imagined. The money to furnish bread and alms, which pious benefactors had left to the needy of the district, passed away from them for ever into the king's purse or the pockets of his courtiers. The thirteen "poor alms men, who had their living" within the old monastic walls, were, through the generosity of the royal commissioners, enriched by the gift of one mark each on being turned out of their old shelter into the world to beg for their living.* What the commonwealth at large lost by the destruction may be gathered from the fact that four hundred horsemen and twice that number of foot are said to have formed the monastic contingent at Flodden field.†

Another great Cistercian house, a near neighbour of Furness, passed into Henry's hands by surrender. The abbey of Holm Cultram was situated upon Morecambe bay, and looked over the waters of the Solway Frith to Scotland. At the time of the dissolution it possessed an income of £535 3s. 7d. It was a royal foundation, and among its annual expenses were pensions for priests, who at the "Jesu altar" in the church offered the daily mass for the soul of Henry II. and the good estate of Henry VIII. Every year on Maunday Thursday alms were distributed equal in value to more than £30 of our money to the "boys brought up in the

* Exch. Augt. Off., *ut sup.*

† Walcott, "English Minsters," ii., p. 124.

cloister," and "to the poor at the abbey gate," that they might remember to pray for the king, while five poor people received their support in the house for the same purpose. At the expense of the monks likewise were maintained the sea-dykes and walls, by which alone the waters of the Solway Firth were prevented from devastating the adjacent country.* At the time when Layton and Legh visited the northern monasteries, in the beginning of 1536, Thomas Carter held the office of abbot, and his community consisted of five-and-twenty monks. The abbot and several of the religious received a bad character from the royal commissioners, which may or may not have been deserved.†

In the summer probably of the same year, 1536, the abbot, Thomas Carter, wrote to Crumwell to beg the exercise of his authority in the reformation of one of his brethren. "For the great love and favour we bore unto our brother, called Dane Thomas Graham (Grame) professed unto our monastery," he says, "we gave under our convent seal a temporal office of proctorship of a church called Wigton, trusting to have him in good conversation." However, Graham turned out badly, and when the convent wished to recall the grant he refused to surrender it. Moreover, he obtained from Rome a dispensation to hold a benefice (*capax beneficiorum*) without leave of his own chapter, and had by virtue of it accepted the office of chaplain to the earl of

* Valor Eccl., v., p. 282.

† Calendar, x., No. 364.

Northumberland. The abbot was powerless in the matter, and hence applied to Crumwell to "force the monk to be reformed."*

But, whatever desire the king might have had for the reformation of monks, nothing was apparently done in this matter until, the northern insurrection breaking out, Thomas Carter was involved in the suspicion of treason in aiding the rebels. Strange to say, his chief accuser was this same Thomas Graham, about whom he had complained. In the first instance he was apparently reported to Crumwell as not observing the injunctions given him by the royal visitors. Before the outbreak of the Lincolnshire rising he had been summoned to London, "to answer before the king and council such things as" should be objected against him, and on October 1st he replied to the order asking to be allowed to appear by "a friend."† The insurrection had already broken out, and Crumwell was obliged to delay his dealing with the refractory abbot until the rising had been quelled in the spring of 1537. A commission was appointed to consider the matter, and it sat in the abbey church. "The articles against the abbot of Holm Cultram for high treason" were presented and signed by the same Thomas Graham, and two other monks gave evidence. The gist of the accusation is, that at the first rising abbot Carter forced his tenants, "upon pain of hanging," to join the commons: that he had

* R. O. Crum. Corr., xvii., 78.

† *Ibid.*, 77.

contributed forty shillings to the expenses of the insurgents: that he was one of the commissioners from the people to Carlisle, and rode near to demand that the city should be delivered up to them: and finally that at the last rising when the people laid siege to Carlisle he had said "almighty God prosper them, for if they speed not this abbey is lost," and upon the saying, "he sent for his subprior and commanded him to cause the brethren to go daily with procession to speed the commons' journey."

Beyond the above, the abbot was accused of violating the injunctions of the king's visitors. It was said that he had admitted women to dine and sup within the precincts of the abbey: that he had sold the monastic plate to the value of £100 or more, that he had given out leases and "convent seals": and that he had given the abbot of Byland "for helping him to his promotion, a salt of gold and silver, worth twenty shillings."*

The abbot, however, appears to have died on the 10th of August and thus to have anticipated his fate.† Writing from Carlisle on August 17th (1537), Sir Thomas Wharton, one of the commissioners, states that he has attended the assizes at Carlisle. "It may further please your lordship," he writes to Crumwell, "to know that, since the death of the late abbot of Holm, there were labours made unto me to sue for one Graham, monk

* Raine's "Hexham Priory," i., Append., cliv.

† Calendar, xi., 276.

of that monastery, who would besides his first fruits to be paid to the king's highness bestow for his preferment to be abbot there 400 marks." *

Graham was unsuccessful, for Crumwell had another worthy to appoint. Gawin Borodale had been about five years before for some months in prison at Furness Abbey on the charge of having caused the death of his abbot, Thomas Carter's predecessor, "in poisoning him." In a letter to Crumwell he had declared his innocency, and asked to be tried "according to the statutes of the holy" Cistercian religion.† Dr. Legh, at the request of the abbots of Furness and Byland, "the visitors and reformators of the Cistercians," had begged Crumwell's favour for him, as "he had well served the king in his house," and was "kept out of his monastery through the sinister information of some evil disposed persons." ‡ It was this Gawin Borodale who received the office of abbot of Holm Cultram in the autumn of 1537, and who, in the March following, resigned the abbey into the king's hands. As in the cases of Jervaulx, Whalley, Kirksted and other monasteries, the superiors of which had been executed for treason, so Holm Cultram would no doubt have come into the royal power by attainder if other arrangements had not been made.

On February 18th, 1538, the king issued a special commission to Thomas Legh, William Blithman,

* *Ibid.*, 319.

† R. O. Crumwell Corr., iv., f. 118.

‡ *Ibid.*, xxii., No. 9 (Aug. 16, 25 Hen. VIII.).

and James Rokeby to repair to the abbey. The commission states that "whereas the abbot and convent of our monastery of Holm Cultram . . . freely and willingly be determined and concluded to surrender all the title and interest of the monastery and of the goods and possessions thereunto belonging into our hands and disposition" the king appoints the above to obtain from the abbot and convent "such sufficient writing under their convent seal as shall be expedient." Further, that at the dissolution they shall promise the abbot and monks "such things as shall be necessary for them and his living according to their discretion; shall make an inventory and survey of the goods and lands, and conduct the sales of the monastic effects."*

Acting upon these instructions the commissioners attended at the monastery upon March 6th, 1538, and at once dispatched James Rokeby to London "to declare the surrender." In their account at the following Michaelmas they acknowledge having sold 802 ounces of plate for £147 11s. 4d., and 146 fadders of lead worth £486, while they have left the covering on the church roof for the further "pleasure of the king because it was the parish church." The monks on being dispatched had various sums given to them, varying from £6 to Robert Langton, the prior, to £2 to each of the three novices.† Gawin Borodale secured for himself a pension of £100

* Exch. Aug. Off. Mins. Accts., 28-29 Hen. VIII., No. 165.

† *Ibid.*

a-year, a house and stables, and all tithes as rector of Holm Cultram,* and most of the community were pensioned† at the same time. To Thomas Graham, the chief accuser of abbot Carter and the monk specially complained of by him, Dr. Legh made the special grant as royal commissioner of "a chapel called Saint Thomas chapel to make him a chamber of there."‡

The survey of the abbey lands taken at the time of the dissolution has one or two items of interest. It speaks of the fishing in the bay belonging to the monastery, and of "a great moss ground wherein the same monks had their pits, which is worth by year twenty-three shillings and fourpence." Likewise "there is," says the document, "a warren of coneys upon the sea banks there, and is worth to be let to farm thirteen shillings."§ The church was saved from destruction through the petition of the inhabitants, "being 18 hundred houseling people in number," as they wrote to Crumwell. "It is not only unto us our parish church, and little enough to receive all us," they said, "but also a great aid succour and defence for us against our neighbours the Scots."||

* Aug. Off. Misc. Bk., 232, f. 43. † *Ibid.*, 233, ff. 2, 170.

‡ Exch. Q.R., $\frac{2}{5}$, No. 5. § Aug. Off. Misc. Bk., 399, p. 57.

|| "Ellis Orig. Letts.," i., Ser. iii., p. 89. The church was pillaged by the Scots in 1216; in 1322 Robert Bruce spoiled it, though it held his father's grave; and sixty years later the monks bought off the earl of Douglas with £200. See Walcott's "Eng. Minsters," ii., p. 140.

The dissolution of two other houses may be here noted, not that their fate had any apparent connection with the northern rising, but that they were brought by some means or other under the law of attainder. These were the Cluniac priory of Lenton, in Nottinghamshire, and the Cistercian abbey of Woburn, in Bedfordshire. The former house, like so many others, had been much disturbed by the action of Crumwell's visitors. One of the monks, Dan Hamlet Pencriche, had brought an accusation against the prior before the council, and finally fled from his monastery, as he had twice before done, carrying away goods belonging to the house.* He was, however, subsequently lodged in the Fleet prison by order of the chancellor,† and although Nicholas Hethe, the prior, had originally been promoted to his post by the good will of Crumwell himself, he soon discovered that his duty to his house forced him to break with his patron. As early as April, 1536, apparently shortly after coming to his office, Hethe wrote to say that his predecessor had left the house much in debt, and that although he had promised Crumwell, through his nephew Richard, £100, he was then only able to pay £60; he hoped that the rest might stand over to Martinmas, or otherwise he would have to borrow money "in London of some merchant" to "keep up hospitality." He concludes by asking that the rule banishing all young men from the cloistered life may

* Calendar, x., No. 655. † R. O. Crum. Corr., xxxii., No. 38.

be relaxed for Lenton. "I beseech," he says, "I may have your favour concerning two young men in our religion at Lenton. All my brethren, except four or five, are very impotent and of great age, and request your favour that they may continue in their religion."*

On the 29th of June, the same year, 1536, the prior is said to have committed some act of treason against the king.† What the treason was does not appear, unless it be the sale of some of the plate of the monastery, sold doubtless to relieve the needs of his community, of which he complained, and for which Godbery, a London goldsmith, who had purchased it, was subsequently forced by Crumwell to refund nearly £20 to his private purse.‡ Whatever his act may have been, the prior was seized and thrown into prison in February, 1538, where he remained till the middle of the following month,§ when he, together with eight of his monks and four labourers of Lenton, were indicted for treason at Nottingham.|| In Crumwell's "remembrances" at this time is entered the following note:—"The suppression of Lenton and the execution of the

* Calendar, x., 1234.

† R. O. Exch. Augt. Off. Misc. Bk., 313*b*, f. 8, a curious list of the dates of the treasons of those attainted.

‡ R. O. Chapter House Bk., B. 1/8, f. 40.

§ R. O. Exch. Aug. Off. Mins. Accts., 29-30 Hen. VIII., 181.

|| R. O. Control. Roll, 30 Hen. VIII., M. 39. The names of the monks were:—Ralph Swenson; Richard Bower; Richard Atkinson; Christopher Browne; John Trewnam; John Adelenton; William Bery; William Gylham.

prior,"* and hence on the "Controlment Roll" is found the record of the conviction of "Nicholas Hethe, prior of Lenton, William Gylham, monk of Lenton," four labourers and a priest for high treason, after whose names are entered the ominous "T et S," "to be drawn and hanged," as the sentence passed upon them. What became of the rest of the monks is not known. None of them obtained any pension from the king, nor apparently did the five poor men, who from the foundation of the monastery in the reign of Henry I., had been maintained by the charity left by the founders† receive any alms upon being deprived of their inheritance. A clear revenue of upwards of £329 a year passed into Henry's hands by the attainder of the monastery, and more than £252 were obtained by the sales of the monastic goods.‡

The story of the destruction of Woburn and the fate of the abbot is rendered even more pathetic by the touching details which have been preserved. In it the veil is lifted and a glimpse is afforded of the fears, hopes and despair which filled the souls of the religious in the short time during which the sword of destruction hung over their heads. Their hearts appear chilled by the uncertain fate which awaited them, their actions paralyzed by the masterful policy of Cromwell and the very fountain of religious life dried up by injunctions conceived

* B. Mus. Cott. MS., Titus B. i., f. 468*d*.

† *Valor Eccl.*, v., 149.

‡ R. O. Exch. Augt. Off. Mins. Acct., 29-30 Hen. VIII., 181.

with a deliberate purpose of making the cloister unbearable and compelling rebellion or surrender.

Richard Hobbes had been abbot of Woburn for many years and, together with his monks, had given in to the royal demands and sworn to the king's "headship." It was clearly against his better judgment, and that of many at least of his monks, that the oath was taken, and they were troubled in conscience at their weakness in not standing out for what they believed to be the only truth. Dan Ralph, the sub-prior, subsequently acknowledged his scruples and begged Henry's pardon for this and the "erroneous estimation of Mr. More and the bishop of Rochester, whose death he a great while thought meritorious, wishing he had died with them." In fact, he declared that it was the abbot himself who, "by counsel and menaces," persuaded him to take the required oath of supremacy. Another of the community, Dan Laurence, the sexton, declared that when he was first sworn he could not touch the book on account of the numbers, and so he considered his conscience was free, although he had signed "the carte of profession."*

Even at the beginning of the year 1536 rumours were circulated about the probable fate of the abbey, and it was said that "it and other more should go down ere Twelfth tide,"† but it was not until the spring of the year 1538 that any steps were taken against it. The final catastrophe was hastened through the

* Calendar x., 1239.

† *Ibid.*, 5.

malicious informations of discontented monks, who, here as in many monasteries of England at this time, served Crumwell as spies upon the acts and words of their superiors and brethren.

On the 12th of May, abbot Hobbes and certain of his monks were examined in the Tower. The superior and some others declared that at the time when the Carthusians were put to death the abbot had called them together and said these words:—
“Brethren this is a perilous time; such a scourge was never heard since Christ’s passion. Ye hear how good men do suffer death. Brethren this is undoubted for our offences. Ye read, so long as the children of Israel kept the commandments of God, so long their enemies had no power over them, but God took vengeance on their enemies; but when they broke God’s commandments, then they were subdued by their enemies, and so be we. Therefore, let us be sorry for our offences and undoubtedly he will take vengeance on our enemies; I mean these heretics that cause so many good men to suffer thus. Alas, it is a piteous case that so much Christian blood should be shed. Therefore, good Christian brethren for the reverence of God, everyone of you devoutly pray and say this psalm:—*Deus venerunt gentes* through, and say this versicle:—*Exurgat Deus et dissipentur inimici*. This foresaid psalm to be said every Friday, immediately after the litany, prostrate, when ye lie before the high altar and undoubtedly God will cease this extreme storm.”

This injunction the monks faithfully carried out although some murmured at the command, and when at the beginning of 1536 parliament passed the act by which the lesser monasteries were suppressed, the abbot again spoke to his monks. "The abbot," says the deposition of four of the monks, "with such like exhortation in the said chapter house, with lamentable mournings for the dissolving of them, enjoined us to sing, '*Salvator mundi salva nos omnes*' every day after Lauds. And we murmured at it, and were not content to sing it for such cause. And so we did omit it divers times, for which the abbot came unto the chapter and did in manner rebuke us and said we were bound to obey his commands by our profession. And so he did command us to sing it again with versicles: '*Exurgat Deus* etc.,' and enjoined us to say at every mass that every priest did sing, a collect: '*Deus qui contritorum*,' etc. And he said if we did thus with good and pure devotion, God would handle the matter so that it should be to the comfort of all England, and so show us mercy as he showed unto the children of Israel. And surely brethren, he said, there will come over us a good man that will reedify these monasteries again that are now suppressed, '*quia potens est Deus de lapidibus istis suscitare filios Abrahæ.*'" *

Meantime during the time of waiting for the final doom there was excitement and contentions among

* R. O. State Papers, Dom., 1538, $\frac{v}{112}$.

the monks, and cross accusations of one party against the other. In the "shaving house" Dan John Croxton was openly accused by a brother, Laurence Blonham, of being one of the "new world." Dan John replied with bitter words, saying that such ideas would get them into trouble, but Blonham answered, "Neither thou nor yet any of us all shall do well as long as we forsake our head of the Church, the pope." Croxton retorted that if he really thought this, he was "a false, perjured knave to his prince," and upon his saying that "he never was sworn to forsake the pope as head, and never would be," said: "Thou shalt be sworn spite of thy heart one day, or I will know why nay."* Another monk, called Crowe, complained of his abbot that, having spoken against the bread supplied to them, he was told "to go further and fare worse."

These and such like tales duly carried to the ears of Crumwell brought the abbot under suspicion. He was arrested and conveyed together with other of his monks to the Tower. He had tried to anticipate the event by a joint letter with his monks handing over themselves and their monastery to the king's mercy. They indeed declared that they acknowledged Henry "to be supreme head" and their "comfort and joy," and were innocent of the charges brought against them, including "high treason."† But the submission, ample and humble as it was, either came too late, or the king had

* *Ibid.*

† Wright, 145.

determined to discourage disobedience in other monasteries, by another example of an abbot ending an honoured life on the scaffold.

In his examination Robert Hobbes practically allowed all that had been advanced against him. With regard to the pope, he does not hesitate to admit that in "much preaching" he has not declared the king "supreme head;" not out of malice, as he says, "but only for a scrupulous conscience he then had touching the continuance of the bishop of Rome." He had got Dan William Hampton, his secretary, to transcribe a book written by John Mylward, priest of Todington, called "De potestate Petri." He will not allow that he spoke of England as an heretical country, for not joining in the general council; nor that he neglected to give up all "papistical bulls" he could find to "Mr. doctor Petre" at the visitation; nor that he neglected to have the pope's name erased out of the "calendars and other books, as mass books, grayles and other usual books of the choir." He commanded the cantor, Dan Robert Neve, and others to obey the king's order in this matter, and himself put the name out of "such books as he had to say his service."

On the other hand, he confesses that, when the papal bulls were sent up to doctor Petre, he got Dan Robert Salford "to write the principal bulls in a fair hand," and the junior monks not priests to transcribe the others in a running hand, so that when

the quarrel between the king and pope was settled he might have evidence of his old privileges and exemptions. These copies, he said, "remained yet in my chamber at my coming away."

He fully admitted his sermons to his brethren, and even himself says he likened Henry to Nebuchadonator taking away the sacred vessels of the temple. Also on several occasions he had spoken to young men "commensals" of the house, as "Mr. Morice, Mr. Carye and Mr. Hervy," whose schoolmaster was very earnest against the "new learning," in the same strain. "And I the said abbot," he says, "confess that in all audiences from time to time I have stood stiffly in my opinions of the old trade unto this present day, maintaining the part of the bishop of Rome, so far as I durst, thinking that it was the true way, and the contrary of the king's part but usurpation desiderated by flattery and adulation."*

As abbot Hobbes had spoken to his brethren and those living in his house, so he had declared for the old faith to his friends outside. To lord Grey of Wilton, he had been explicit as to his opinions, and also to Dan Augustin, "the quondam" of Wardon, who was staying at Woburn. Most plainly of all had he opened his mind to Sir Francis Brian, and throughout his examinations he manifests a fear lest his friendship with Sir Francis should be considered detrimental to that gentleman's interests.

* B. Mus. Cott. MS. Cleop. E. iv., f. 108.

He had often been at Ampthill with him, and always took care to extol the teaching of the "old fathers Catholic," and specially condemned the preaching of Latimer "as touching our Lady and the saints." On one occasion especially, after the Lent of 1538, he was with a large company at Sir Francis's house at Ampthill. He went, "after loving cheer and disports," together with Brian to his bedroom. Here he saw a "goodly book," which proved to be the new English translation of the Bible. He took advantage of the chance to speak about it. "It is a fair book," he said, "but in my opinion not well interpreted in many places, which hereafter may be the cause of much error." Sir Francis opened the volume and turned to the place in St. Luke which speaks of the "consecration of the blessed Body and Blood." Having read it, he asked the abbot what he thought about it. He confessed that it was good, but took occasion to say again that there were many false translations in the volume.*

The abbot admitted that he had wished he had died with the Carthusians, More and Fisher. He was ill at the time, a few weeks before his imprisonment, and, as the accuser says, "Dan Ralph Woburn, subprior, reported in his own chamber to one Dan William Hampton, in the presence of this examinat, that the abbot from whom he came a little before said to him (after he had asked him how he did) that he wished himself to have died

* *Ibid.*, f. 109.

with the good men that died for holding with the pope, and said that his conscience doth grudge him daily for it. Whereunto this examinat," says the accuser, "answered, 'If he be disposed to die for that matter, he may die as soon as he will.'"^{*}

"And finally," says abbot Hobbes in his confession, "as touching acts of the archbishop of Canterbury in ordaining and consecration of bishops, dispensations of matrimony, capacities given to religious men, I have thought he had no authority so to do, without power of the bishop of Rome, and in like wise all such things done by him, not lawfully exercised by those that have received such dignities and dispensations from him."

Also when he heard of any new suppressions, he confesses having said something to the following effect : "Mercy to God, it is a wonderful thing the king's grace cannot be content with what his parliament has given him, but ever more and more bringeth down the holy monasteries, which his predecessors and other noble founders have ordained to thank God for their souls' healths, and endowed with possessions to the intent that religious persons should pray for them and maintain alms and hospitality for poor men. And his grace hath not as yet built any house of prayer, not so much as one chantry for himself." And this although a better prince "never was till now of late." For all the change he blamed the advice of Crumwell and the

^{*} State Papers, Dom., 1538, *ut sup.*

unfortunate divorce question, from which he traced all other miseries.*

This ample confession, which was evidently made by the advice of Crumwell, pitifully reveals mind and soul and heart in all their perplexities. But the abbot had also vividly before him the horrors of imprisonment and the thought of a terrible death. Under stress of this fear, before his examination is concluded he, in accents more pitiful still, admits that he may have been mistaken after all, and prays for pardon.

This is but a picture of the anguish of conscience and sinking of heart in dread of an uncertain end which must have been the experience of thousands in that terrible day. The storm burst first and most heavily, as usual, not on the practised theologian and skilled dialectician, but on men who most lived by authority and tradition. By instinct they knew what was right. Their conscience "was scrupulous touching the continuance of the bishop of Rome." They maintained his part "as far as they durst, thinking it was the true way," and regarding with equal distrust and fear the ecclesiastical policy of Henry and the acts of Cranmer, believing the archbishop "had no authority to do as he did without power of the bishop of Rome." The expectation was general that the "quarrel," as it was esteemed, between the king and the pope would be made up again. To men wise after the event, such an expectation may seem to betoken a simplicity border-

* B. Mus. Cleop., E. iv., f. 111.

ing on foolishness, but to men in those days it was a sheet-anchor of hope.

To those in the position of the abbot of Woburn the immediate interests were pressing, involving both the welfare of brethren, servants, dependants, friends, and the fate of a home they loved. Such considerations must have added a moral weight to suggestions prompted first by personal fears, and helped them, it may be, even to deceive themselves. Like prior Houghton of the Carthusians, they might come to believe that they were making themselves anathema for the sake of their brethren, and even "the daily grudge of conscience" would appear to men of this stamp, but part of the sore burden to be borne in their Master's service. So subtle is the mind in finding the highest motives to avert an evil before which the flesh quails and the heart sinks. All that had to be done for the moment was to hold out and gain time.

But such a surrender of convictions as that to which abbot Hobbes had brought himself was all in vain. His prayer for pardon was denied; he was not allowed to live. Henry had passed beyond the stage of compassion for any human weakness, of pity for any living soul. The abbot was apparently tried at Lincoln, together with Laurence Blonham, or Peck, and Richard Woburn, or Barnes, two monks of the abbey, and all three being found guilty were ordered to be drawn, hanged and quartered.* Of the two monks thus condemned, one, Laurence Blonham,

* R. O. Control. Roll, 30 Hen. VIII., m. 6d.

was he who in the "shaving house" had declared he never would "be sworn to forsake the pope." The other, Richard, or, as he is otherwise called, "Ralph," Woburn or Barnes, was the subprior of whom abbot Hobbes has left it on record, that he "always held the strongest views and expressed them" on the matter of the pope's authority.*

The abbot, together with the vicar of Puddington and others, were hanged before the gate of Woburn abbey, and tradition, as late as the beginning of this century, pointed to an old oak tree in front of the monastery as the gallows upon which the monks were executed.†

The possessions of the abbey, producing a clear income of nearly £400 a-year,‡ thus passed into the royal hands by the new interpretation of the law of attainder on the 20th of June, 1538. By the 29th of September the royal receiver for attainted lands acknowledged from sales of the monastic goods the sum of £266 12s.§ A few years later this property was granted, together with many other broad acres belonging to the Church and the poor to Sir John Russell.

* Cleop., E. iv., f. 106d.

† B. Mus. Add. MS. 27,402, p. 47, gives only *one* monk—"the prior" executed with the abbot. The parson of Puddington's name was *John Henmersh*.—Cont. Roll., 31 Hen. VIII.—Dodd's "Woburn," 1818, p. 38.

‡ Valor Eccl., iv., p. 213.

§ R. O. Exch. Augt. Off. Mins. Accts., 29-30 Hen. VIII., 181, m 3.

CHAPTER VI.

THE SUPPRESSION OF CONVENTS.

SEVERAL circumstances relating to the destruction of English nunneries render some brief account of them advisable. Many things combined to render the dissolution of conventual establishments and the disbanding of religious more terrible to nuns than to monks. A woman compelled to exchange the secluded life of a cloister with all its aids to piety for an existence in the world, to which she could never rightly belong, would be obviously in a more dangerous and unbearable position than a man. To the monk, who was also a priest, there was always a possible future in the exercise of his sacred calling, and however remote his chance of obtaining a cure of souls or other sacerdotal employment, when the tendency of Henry's policy was on every hand to destroy the influence and diminish the occupation of the clergy, still, the bare possibility must have rendered expulsion from home less hopeless in its outlook. The nun's lot, however, had no such ray of consolation. Even had the circumstances attending her dismissal from conventual life been more fortunate, or the result of her own act and choice, her future must have been dark and uncertain, since the vows which bound her heart and conscience

must keep her always apart from the secular surroundings in which she was compelled to exist. The cleric, even although his monk's garb were torn from him, and he was forced to trudge the world in poverty, could not be deprived of the sacred character of the clerical state; but the nun, driven from the dismantled walls of her convent, and the veil of her profession denied to her, could not but suffer the pains of daily martyrdom in the rough surroundings of an uncongenial world.

At the time of the dissolution there were in England about one hundred and forty convents of women. Of these rather more than half belonged to the Benedictine order. They were scattered over the face of the country; the county of York containing a greater proportion than any other. The majority were not possessed of a yearly income sufficient to exempt them from the operation of the act by which the lesser houses passed into the king's hands. In Yorkshire alone, more than half the convents were suppressed under cover of this act of dissolution.

With regard to the regularity and order which prevailed in the English nunneries at the time of their destruction, it will be sufficient here to indicate that even Layton and Legh in their celebrated "*comperta*" are able to bring comparatively few charges against their good name. It will be remembered that the reports of these worthy emissaries of Crumwell embraced some thirteen counties, and only

twenty-seven nuns in all the convents they visited are charged with vice of any kind. Even of these seven-and-twenty all but ten can be identified as subsequently receiving the grant of a pension.* It is, moreover, most remarkable that even Layton and his fellow visitor can only name two nuns, out of all the convents visited, who are anxious to cast off the restraints of religious life; and this, even after the imposition of vexatious injunctions, the very acknowledged purpose of which was to render the practice of religious life unendurable.

In the subsequent reports of the mixed commissions the character given to the convents is uniformly most excellent. Thus the White nuns of Grace Dieu in Leicestershire, the only convent of the order in England, are declared to be "of good and virtuous conversation and living, and all desirous to continue their religion there and none willing to have capacities" to return to a life in the world. They were fifteen in number, and their convent, situated in the wilds of Charnwood forest, was a blessing to the neighbourhood. Although their whole available income was under £100 a year, they yet gave employment to thirty-six dependents, and twelve people, nine of whom were absolute paupers, were supported in the convent.† Besides this, out of their scanty income they had to distribute on the anniversary of the death of their foundress a sum equal to £20 of our money, to

* *Vide* Vol. i., p. 353.

† Calendar, x., p. 497.

obtain the prayers of the poor for the repose of her soul.*

A few months before this report the previous royal visitors had accused two of the nuns of the worst offences,† who are now declared to be “of good and virtuous conversation.” The house came, of course, within the pecuniary limit appointed by the act dissolving the lesser houses of religion, but on August 17th the prioress, Agnes Litherland, received the king’s license to continue. For “divers causes and considerations,” the convent was allowed to be re-established “in perpetuity,” and the prioress was continued in her office.‡ On October 21st, 1538, however, the house was suppressed by Dr. Legh, who promised Cecily Bagnald, then apparently the prioress, a pension of £40 a year.§ On the 20th of the following December, fifteen other nuns, amongst whom were the two so grievously incriminated by doctors Layton and Legh, were also granted pensions.

In the same way the poor priory of black Benedictine nuns at Langley, in the same county, received an equally good character from the mixed commissioners. There were six nuns besides the prioress, “who is,” says the report, “of great age and impotent; all are of good and virtuous living and conversation; one is sister to the late sir Richard

* Valor. Eccl., iv., 175.

† Calendar, x., p. 183.

‡ Rot. Pat., 28 Hen. VIII., Pars. ii., m. 113.

§ R. O. Augt. Off. Misc. Bk., 245, f. 225.

Saccheverell, almost 80 years old, 'one other is in regard a fool.' All are desirous to continue in religion."* They had a chaplain, fourteen dependents, and two people living in the house, to whom they had granted a perpetual corrody. Of a thirtieth part of their small revenue they were only the trustees, being bound by their founder to distribute corn and money, worth in these days some £10, every year, on the Wednesday in Holy week, to twelve widows, that they might pray for the repose of his soul.† On the 24th of June, 1536, the royal commissioners descended upon the priory, and the process of dissolution took them exactly three months. The plate and jewels belonging to the church and house, including a silver vessel weighing 108 ounces, and a "pix" for the blessed Sacrament of 16 ounces, were estimated to be worth nearly £60, and were forthwith dispatched to the royal treasury. The prioress, Dulcosa Bothe, was obliged during the months of weary waiting for the end, to sell a silver salver and eleven spoons in order to keep up the hospitality and alms of the house.‡ The vestments and moveables of the convent were sold for more than £81; while the lead on the roofs and gutters, together with two small bells, were appraised at £34 more. When all arrangements had been made, on September 24th, the nuns were ex-

* Calendar, x., p. 247.

† Valor. Eccl. iv., 176.

‡ Besides this, she accounted for £47 4s. 2½d., received from rents, as spent on the support of the house. Exch. A. O. Mins. Accts. 27-28 H. VIII., 90, m. 28.

pelled, and thirty-six shillings and eightpence was distributed amongst them.* There were no pensions, apparently, granted to any of the nuns. Very probably the prioress, to whom, according to the rule followed in most of the early dissolutions, some small allowance would have been made, did not long survive her expulsion, since she was "of great age and impotent" at the time. In Mary's reign, one nun only, Isabel Seton, appears on the pension list of the survivors of the dissolved monasteries.†

Among the religious houses, which ought to have been suppressed under the act for the dissolution of the lesser monasteries, but which purchased from the king a royal grant to continue, were twenty-one convents of women. The nuns who thus obtained a temporary respite were some 273, and their dependents may be considered to have equalled four or five times that number. The price they paid to the king's treasury as purchase money for their own convents and for leave to continue in the cloister was, in almost every case where payment had been made before the final catastrophe, greatly in excess of their annual revenue. About half the number, chiefly those situated in the northern counties, had apparently paid nothing when their property was again seized by Henry. The others, although the

* R. O. Exch. Augt. Off. Mins. Accts., 27-28 Hen. VIII., 168, m. 4.

† B. Mus. Add. MS., 8102, Co. Leicester.

treasurer of the augmentation office is careful to note that the sums entered were only "part payment," and that the arrears due had been forgiven them as they had come into the king's hand before the settlement of the debt, paid dearly for their continuance. Thus Lacock, a convent of eighteen nuns in Wiltshire, paid £300, their annual income being only £168, and St. Mary's, Chester, which maintained its thirteen nuns upon the slender income of £66 a year, was compelled to purchase exemption by a payment of £160.*

If these sums are large, there can be little doubt that many other payments were made, either as bribes to induce the king's officials to interest themselves in the preservation of various houses, or to obtain the royal favour by money offered personally to him. Thus the prioress of Catesby wrote to Crumwell that "the queen had moved the king for me, and offered him 2,000 marks for the house of Catesby, but has not yet a perfect answer." She begs the all-powerful minister in her "great sorrow" to get the king to allow the house to stand, "and," she adds, "get me years of payment for the 2,000 marks. You shall have 100 marks of me to buy a gelding, and my prayers during my life, and all my sisters during their lives." She concludes by reminding Crumwell of the report the commissioners had sent of her house, and although as she hears a grant has already been made of the house, still she

* R. O. Exch. Aug. Off. Treasurer's Roll, i., m. 4d.

trusts to the efforts of the queen and him that its destruction may be averted.*

On May 12th the commissioners themselves anticipated their report of the visitation in Northamptonshire to try and save the convent. The "house of Catesby," they say, "we found in very perfect order, the prioress a pure, wise, discreet and very religious woman with nine nuns under her obedience, as religious and devout, and with as good obedience as we have in time past seen or belike shall see. The said house standeth in such a quarter much to the relief of the king's people, and his grace's poor subjects there likewise much relieved, as by the report of divers worshipful (men) near thereunto adjoining, as of all other that is to us openly declared. Wherefore if it should please the king's highness to have any remorse that any such religious house shall stand, we think his grace cannot appoint any house more meet to show his most gracious charity and pity to than to the said house of Catesby." They praise the "discreet entertainment" the prioress showed to the commissioners and write thus, "lest peradventure there may be labour made to her detriment and utter undoing, before knowledge should come to his highness and to you from us," and that the king "may stay the grant" of the house.†

This petition on behalf of the nuns of Catesby, from the very commissioners, perhaps did harm to

* Calendar, x., 383.

† Wright, 129.

the cause they wished to serve. The chancellor of the augmentation office showed Henry the letter, and subsequently he declared that "the king's highness was displeased, as he said to my servant Thomas Harper, saying that it was like that we had received rewards, which caused us to write as we did."* George Gyffard, the writer of the above letters, informed Crumwell on the 27th of June that by order of "Mr. Chancellor and Mr. Attorney of the Augmentation" the commissioners had returned to Catesby "to begin our suppression." Even then, however, they were loath to execute the decree of expulsion and asked whether the order from the augmentation office was "a sufficient warrant."†

Crumwell's reply was, no doubt, an order to proceed with the unwelcome work, for the suppression was immediately commenced. The establishment consisted of nine nuns besides the prioress, twenty-six dependents, the vicar of Catesby, two assistant chaplains and one parish clerk paid by the convent. The royal officers seized plate to the value of £29 4s., sold the furniture of the house, with the vestments and other ornaments of the church, for more than £400, and estimated that the lead, which had been torn from the roof and melted, would bring in £110 more, besides £3 for the broken metal of two handbells.‡

* *Ibid.*, 136.

† Calendar, x., 1215.

‡ R. O. Exch. Aug. Off. Mins. Accts., 27-28 Hen. VIII., 173, m. 2.

The work of dissolution took some time, and it was not till after September 27th that the nuns were finally turned adrift. John Tregonwell, one of Crumwell's emissaries, gave them a good character to the last. "The prioress there," he says, "is a right sad matron; the sisters also there now being by the space of twenty years hath been (by as much as I can learn) without suspicion of incontinent living."*

Joyce Bykeley, the prioress, was granted by letters patent a pension of £20 a year from July 2nd, 1536.† The payment for this sum was made to her, as appears in the "Minister's Accounts," until Michaelmas, 1541, when no charge is entered on her behalf and the pension apparently ceased.

The fines paid to the king for the continuance of the convents reduced some of them, as already pointed out in the case of Stixwold, to a state of absolute beggary. It was made a plea by the commissioners for an increase of pension in some instances when the final doom came upon them. Thus Dr. London, writing to the chancellor Rich on the final dissolution of the convent of Pollesworth, says:—"The convent to the great charge of the friends lately purchased again of the king, in your high court, the house to continue." And as "the abbess hath always been reputed a virtuous woman and a good housewife," he strongly advocates giving her

* R. O. Crum. Corr. xliii., No. 59.

† Exch. Augt. Off. Misc. Bk., 244, f. 32, "Orig. of Grants."

a pension of £26 13s. 4d. a year.* In the same way Alice Baldwin, the abbess of Burnham, is recommended for a small annual allowance "in consideration that she redeemed her house,"† and, to give but one more example, the same royal commissioner writes, that he and Dr. Baskerfield had dissolved the Cistercian house of Delapray, although the nuns had purchased "the same of the king that it should continue." They have consequently promised, he says, £40 a year to the abbess, for "she is very sickly and an aged woman and hath been abbess there about thirty years, and hath lived always like a virtuous woman, and her house in like manner was well ordered."‡

The convents of England were chiefly small as regards numbers and poor in their resources. In fact, had not the king been persuaded to hold his hand for a time, the act dissolving monasteries and convents under £200 a year would have swept away all but eighteen of the houses of religious women. Only twelve out of the eighty-four convents of the Benedictine order were possessed of revenues greater than the pecuniary limit assigned by the act. Of the twenty-six Cistercian houses, one only, that of

* R. O. Exch. Augt. Off. Misc. Bk., 245, f. 15. The reason here assigned for granting the prioress a good pension is also urged in other cases.

† *Ibid.*, f. 29. The grant for this convent to continue is enrolled on Rot. Pat., 29 Hen. VIII., Pars. v., m. 17. The account of the treasurer does not mention any money.

‡ *Ibid.*, f. 38.

Tarrant, in Dorsetshire, was exempted from the operation of the act, whilst of the rest, one Augustinian, the Bridgettines of Sion, the ladies of St. John of Jerusalem at Buckland, and two houses of nuns, of the Order of St. Gilbert, were rich enough to escape suppression in the year 1536. Special legislation was apparently made for the latter order, and one-and-twenty of the smaller convents purchased a temporary existence from the king, but with all the exceptions, there could not have been fifty convents throughout England spared, when once the process of destruction commenced.

As regards the resources of the convents, a very large proportion appear to have been extremely poor. Fourteen out of the twenty-six Cistercian houses of women had an income of less than £50 a year each, while nearly half the Benedictine convents were equally straitened in their resources. Many of them were, without doubt, burdened with considerable debts, which the late exactions of Henry and his visitors on the eve of the dissolution had helped to increase. At Synningthwaite, a Cistercian convent of ten nuns in Yorkshire, which possessed an income of £62 a year, it became necessary shortly before the dissolution to apply to the archbishop for leave to sell certain silver vessels for the purpose of diminishing the obligations of the house* ; a permission which, "on account of the great debts" with which the nuns were burdened, was accorded to them.

* Reg. Lee, f. 89d.

The "injunctions" made by the archbishop of York at his visitation on October 14th, 1534, to this convent of Synningthwaite afford an insight into the conventual life of the place only a few months before the royal commissioners appeared there to expel the nuns, and take the revenues for their royal master. "Edward, by the sufferance of God," runs the document, "archbishop of York, primate of England and Metropolitan, to our beloved daughters in Christ, the prioress and convent of Synningthwaite of our said diocese sendeth greeting and his blessing. . . . We tendering the health of your souls, profit of your monastery and increase of religion have made these injunctions hereafter, by you and everyone of you to be observed and kept.

"First, we enjoin and command by these presents that all and everyone of the sisters be obedient to the prioress in all things lawful and honest without any grudge or murmur, and obey her lawful commandments, monitions and corrections reverently, and also observe poverty and chastity according to Saint Benet's rule which they have professed, as they will avoid straight punishment due for the same.

"Item we enjoin and straightly command the said prioress that she provide that the doors of the cloister be surely locked every night, incontinent as compline is done, and that the same doors be not unlocked in winter season until seven o'clock in the morning, and in summer until six o'clock." The keys are

to be in the hands of the prioress or "such discreet and religious sister" as she may appoint. In like manner the dormitory door is to be fastened "until service time" and the key kept by the prioress, "as she will avoid the straight punishment of the law.

"Item" no "secular woman whatsoever they be" shall be allowed to sleep in the nun's "dorter." "Item we enjoin and command by these presents that from henceforth the prioress shall diligently provide, that no secular nor religious persons have any resort or recourse at any time to her or any of her said sisters, on any occasion, unless it be their fathers and mothers, or other near kinsfolk. . . .

"Item we enjoin all the nuns and sisters there that they keep no secular women to serve them or do any business for them, but if sickness or other necessity do require, we enjoin and command the prioress to provide that the infirmaress, if there be any, (or to appoint one of the sisters) oversee, that the sick sisters want nothing necessary for them. This thing we command the prioress diligently to observe and keep under pain of the law.

"Item by these presents we command and enjoin all and everyone of the said sisters that they keep silence in the choir, in the cloister, frater and dorter according to their rule, under the pains of cursing and as they will avoid punishment due therefor."

After providing that all the nuns shall have their meals together, and that even when sick they shall eat in the "infirmary" or some "other appointed

place," the archbishop directs, that no "pension or corrody or livery" be granted, nor any "lease" made without his permission, and that no "wood" be sold without the consent of the majority of the nuns.

"Item we command that the said prioress nor her convent shall admit any person to the professed habit of a nun or a sister or a converse;* nor shall receive any secular or spiritual person to sojourn or dwell within the precinct of that monastery without special license had and obtained of us or our successors under our or their seal.

"Item we command etc. the said prioress and everyone of the said convent that they make nor grant to any person to be admitted or received a nun or a converse of that house for money or other pleasure or advantage, by reason of a pact made for the same purpose; for such admissions be damnable and be plain simony. Albeit we do not prohibit the prioress to take anything, which is or shall be offered or given by devotion unto the place at such time as any shall be admitted a sister, so that it be given freely without pact, covenant or bargain made for that purpose.

"Item" the convent seal shall be kept as is usual under three locks. Also that no one shall be blamed or rebuked for any injunction made at visitation, or shall mention anything done in chapter "to any person either secular or religious."

"Item we command etc. under pain of the more

* Lay-sister.

curse, all and everyone of the nuns of that house that none of them go forth of the house without license obtained of the prioress. And also we command and exhort the said prioress in virtue of obedience, that she from henceforth license none of her sisters to go forth of the house unless it be for the profit of the house or to visit their fathers and mothers, or other their near kinsfolk, if the prioress shall think it convenient, and then the prioress shall assign some sad and discreet religious sister to go with her, and that she limit them a time to return, that they be not over long out of the monastery."

The next order recalls the regulation by which once a year the accounts of the house are to be explained in the presence of the whole convent or at least to "the more part of the eldest, most wise and discreet" nuns.

The archbishop then goes on to enjoin "the prioress and all the nuns there, under the pain of cursing that she nor none of them, being not sick nor absent out of the house for any just cause or otherwise hindered about the business of the house by command of the prioress, be absent from divine service by any manner of occasion, wherein we charge the prioress' conscience that she herself keep these our injunctions for her part and cause them to be observed for her sisters' part, and that the breakers hereof be so punished that the rest shall be afraid to do the like offence." "Also we enjoin the said prioress that she provide that the nuns of the said house have sufficient meat and drink at convenient

hours ; that is to say, that their dinner be ready at eleven o'clock or soon after and their supper at five o'clock or soon after.

“ Item,” the document concludes, “ because these our injunctions may be the better remembered and also the penalties for breaking or violating of the same may be avoided, we therefore command the said prioress, in virtue of obedience, that she cause these our injunctions to be read at least once a month in the chapter house in the presence of all her sisters.”*

These injunctions were given to more than one Yorkshire convent at this time. From like documents in the same episcopal register various other slight but interesting details may be gathered. Everything approaching to differences in the treatment of members of the same house, whether in matters of food or clothing, was zealously guarded against. The ideal of “ common life ” was strictly striven after. At Nunappleton, for example, the prioress and sisters are exhorted “ to eat one bread and drink one drink and of one all,” so that there may be no difference made between the food served to the superior and the subjects.

The same prioress is warned not to let secular persons “ into the hall when the sisters be at dinner or supper, except such women as be necessary and accustomed to serve them at table.” This order is followed by another, that “ so many spoons be laid on the convent table, both dinner and supper, as

* Reg. Lee, ff. 96-98.

there are sisters present." The three concluding "injunctions" to the same convent are curious. "Item," the first of the three runs, "we enjoin etc. that the sick sisters of that house (according to) their conditions and qualities of their diseases be kept and looked to, and that gross meats not convenient for sick folks be changed into lighter meats during the time of their sickness.

"Item we enjoin etc. the said prioress that she provide a laundress to wash her sisters' clothes according to the old laudable custom of that house." And, finally, "we enjoin etc. the prioress that she provide that the convent of that house have a fire in the hall from the feast of All Saints unto Good Friday according to the old laudable custom."

The method of life in one convent must have been much what it was in every other throughout the land. The nuns often came from the highest families, and mixed with their neighbours in kindly intercourse, and were by them well known and loved. As may have been judged from the extracts given above from the registers of the diocese of York, rigid enclosure was then almost unknown. The sisters, as has been well said, "were indeed not of the world, but they were in it, actively and intelligently to do a good work to it—to elevate, to console, to purify and to bless."*

* The portrait of the prioress given in Chaucer, who
 "Was so charitable and so pitous,
 And al was conscience and tender herte,"
 will recur to many when considering the pre-reformation conventual life of England.

It is unnecessary to speak of the many blessings which must have accrued to a neighbourhood by the presence of a convent of cultivated English ladies. Their gentle teaching was the first experience of the youthful poor; from them they derived their early knowledge of the elements of religion and of Catholic practice; to them they went in the troubles and cares of life as to a source of good advice; theirs was the most potent civilizing influence in the rough days of the middle ages; and theirs was the task of tending the sick and smoothing the passage of the Christian soul to eternity.

To the bounty of these religious ladies, as the "titles" to ordination in the episcopal registers show, a large number of the secular clergy of England owed their ecclesiastical position, while there is abundant evidence that the ranks of the regular orders received many recruits through their generosity and self-sacrifice. In the convents, the female portion of the population found their only teachers, the rich as well as the poor,* and the destruction of these religious houses by Henry was the absolute extinction of any systematic education for women during a long period. Thus at Winchester convent, the

* In the "Canterbury Tales" the miller of Trompington is described as both well to do and well married:—

"A wyf he hadde, come of noble kyn;
Sche was i-fostryd in a nonnerye . . .
Ther durste no wight clepe hir but *Madame*
What for hir kindred and hir nortelrye
That sche had lerned in the nonnerye."

Reeves' Tale, ll. 3940, etc.

list of the ladies being educated within the walls at the time of the suppression shows that these Benedictine nuns were training the children of the first families in the county.* Carrow, in Norfolk, for centuries gave instruction to the daughters of the neighbouring gentry, and as early as A.D. 1273 a papal prohibition was obtained from pope Gregory X. restraining the nobility from crowding this monastery with more sisters than its income could support.† And according to the evidence of Robert Aske the people of Yorkshire objected strongly to the suppression scheme, because "in nunneries their daughters (were) brought up in virtue."‡

The declaration made by the royal commissioners as to the good done by the convent of Pollesworth, in Warwickshire, is worthy of being here given in its entirety. It may be premised that these Benedictine nuns possessed an income of only £87 a year, and had, previous to this letter, paid some £50 for the king's permission to remain in religion, which money, as before noted, they had borrowed from their friends.

"After our duties of humble recommendation unto your good lordship made," Crumwell's agents write to him, "it may please the same to be advertised that we have surveyed the monastery or nunnery of Pollesworth in the county of Warwick. Therein is an abbess named dame Alice Fitzherbert, of the age

* "Monasticon," II., p. 452. † Taylor, "Index Monasticus," viii.

‡ *Vide* Chapter III.

of 60 years, a very sad, discreet and religious woman, and hath been head and governor there twenty-seven years. And in the same house, under her rule are 12 virtuous and religious nuns, and of good conversation, as far as we can hear or perceive as well by our examinations as by the open fame and report of all the country. And never one of the nuns there will leave nor forsake their habit and religion. Wherefore in our opinions, if it might so stand with your lordship's pleasure, ye might do a right good and meritorious deed to be a mediator to the king's highness for the said house to stand and remain unsuppressed; for as we think ye shall not speak in the preferment of a better nunnery nor of better women.

"And in the town of Pollesworth are 44 tenements, and never a plough but one, the residue be artificers, labourers and victualers, and live in effect by the said house. And the repair and resort there, is made to the gentlemen's children and sojourners that there do live to the number, sometimes of thirty and sometimes of forty and more, that there be right virtuously brought up. And the town and nunnery standeth in a hard soil and barren ground, and to our estimation if the nunnery be suppressed the town will shortly after fall to ruin and decay, and the people therein, to the number of six or seven score persons, are not unlike to wander and to seek their living as our Lord God best knoweth."*

* Wright, 139.

The occupations of the nuns in their cloisters were the same as those described by an eye-witness at a Wiltshire convent. There, says John Aubrey, "the young maids were brought up (not at Hakney Sarum Schools, &c., to learn pride and wantonness, but) at the nunneries, where they had examples of piety, and humility, and modesty, and obedience to imitate and to practise. Here they learned needle-work, the art of confectionery, surgery (for anciently there were no apothecaries or surgeons—the gentlewomen did cure their poor neighbours: their hands are now too fine), physic, writing, drawing, &c. Old Jacques could see from his house the nuns of the priory (St. Mary's near Kington St. Michael) come forth into the nymph-hay * with their rocks † and wheels to spin: and with their sewing work. He would say that he had told threescore and ten: but of nuns there were not so many, but in all, with lay-sisters, as widows, old maids and young girls there might be such a number. This," concludes the author, "was a fine way of breeding up young women, who are led more by example than precept; and a good retirement for widows and grave single women to a civil, virtuous and holy life." ‡

* A meadow "on the east side of the house, with a delightful prospect on the south-east."

† *i.e.*, distaff.

‡ Aubrey's "Collections," Ed. "Wilts Archæological Society," p. 12. The last prioress of the convent of Kington was Mary Dennys. She "lived," says the same authority, "a great while after the Reformation, and died within the memory of man in

It is impossible to reflect on the trials and difficulties to which the nuns were exposed during the few years which elapsed before their final dispersion, without a sense of horror. To be exposed to the questionings of such men as Layton, Legh and London in their visitation must have been an experience for ladies happily unique in the annals of England. It has been before remarked * that Dr. Ortez, writing at the time, charges one of the commissioners with speaking "immodestly to the nuns," while Sanders has mentioned Legh as "tempting the religious to sin," and as "more ready to inquire into and speak about uncleanness of living than anything else." †

When the final doom of the monastic houses was decided on, some fifty convents of women were left to seize. It was important that the surrender of the greater houses, by which means alone the king could legally become possessed of their property, should appear to be voluntary, and every pressure was brought to bear upon the monks and nuns to induce them to resign their Somersetshire. (*From my grandfather Lyte*.)" The editor notes that "she died 1593 at Bristol and was buried in the church of the Gaunts on the green."

* Vol. i., p. 266.

† "Anglican Schism," Lewis' Transl., p. 129. Those who wish to see this most repulsive side of a sad record may turn to the pages of Fuller, where it is drawn out in sufficient detail. It is evident that the blood of the old Puritan was stirred within him, and he must have felt that the disgraceful relations made to him were only too true, "Church Hist." (ed. 1837), ii., 216.

charges into Henry's hands. The methods pursued in this matter can best be understood by the precise instructions issued for the guidance of those engaged in the work. These agents are ordered to take "the consent of the head and convent by way of their fair surrender under their convent seal to the same. If they shall willingly consent and agree, the said commissioners shall appoint unto the said head and every of their convent pensions for term of their lives, and also give unto them by way of reward such sums of money for the change of their apparel and likewise such portions of the household stuff," as they think proper.

"And if they shall find any of the said heads and convents, so appointed to be dissolved, so wilful and obstinate that they will in no wise submit themselves to the king's majesty in manner and form aforesaid; in that case the said commissioners shall take possession of the house and lands, the jewels, plate, cattle, stuff and all other things belonging to them, to the king's majesty's use by force of the last act made for the alteration of all spiritual tenures at his majesty's pleasure.

"And in that case," if they will not resign at the king's wish, the commissioners "shall cause the brethren or sisters" to change their religious dress and give them money for the purpose, but they shall neither give pensions nor any part of their household goods to "such obstinate and wilful persons, till they shall know further of the king's pleasure."

“And if they shall find any of them so indurate that they will not yield thereunto according to their bounden duties, they shall commit such persons to such place or keeping for their punishment, as for the time and opportunity their wisdom shall think convenient.”

Further, as regards the property, the royal officers are ordered to retain all plate, jewels and ornaments “meet for the king’s use,” and compare what they find with previous inventories, that they may see that the property has been “well administered.” Also they are to examine well what plate or other valuables are missing “to the great damage of the king’s majesty.”*

It would be natural to suppose that when pressure, of a nature disclosed in these secret instructions to the royal agents, was brought to bear upon convents, the ladies would readily acquiesce in Henry’s designs. The two methods adopted to secure a voluntary surrender—the one a promise of a pension and other substantial advantages, the other a threat of deprivation of even a scanty means of subsistence, and perhaps further punishment—were calculated to allure or alarm the helpless inmates of monastic houses, and in particular the nuns, to compliance. But the design was only very partially successful as regards the convents, and even the success was marked by some extraordinary drawbacks. It is true, that of the fifty convents which survived the first dissolution the

* R. O. Chapt. House Bk., A. 40, f. i., *et seq.*

surrenders of some three-and-thirty are enrolled on the close rolls. But the original documents preserved in the Record office prove that, for some reason or other, the papers drawn up in blank form by the commissioners, in the majority of cases, numbering no less than twenty-eight, never received the signatures of the nuns at all. Of the remaining five, one, the surrender of the great abbey of Shaftesbury, a convent of fifty-six nuns, and at the dissolution of which Crumwell himself assisted, is signed only by Elizabeth Zouche, the abbess.

A second document, that of Tarent, although having twenty signatures, is worthless, as all are written in the same hand.* Of the whole number of convents, therefore, only three signed surrenders exist. In the case of Nuneaton convent the document is dated the 12th of December, 1539, and has no names, but twenty-seven crosses, appended to it.† Nesham, the surrender of which, without signatures, is dated December 9th, was suppressed by four commissioners on the 21st of the same month.‡ And the Benedictine nuns of Newcastle, the surrender of which to Dr. Layton, also unsigned, is said to have been made on January 3rd, 1540, was already suppressed by Dr. Legh and three others, on December 31st, 1539.§ Other evidence exists besides the absence of surrender deeds to show that the nuns of England resisted, in a heroic manner, the tempting

* Eighth Rep. of Dep. Keeper, App. ii., p. 43. † *Ibid.*, p. 35.

‡ R. O. Exch. Augt. Off. Misc. Bk., 246, f. 9. § *Ibid.*, f. 7.

offers to resign their trusts and the religious life itself at the bidding of the king. At the end of March, 1539, three royal commissioners, Tregonwell, Peter and Smyth, came to the Benedictine convent of Ambresbury, in Wiltshire. They had received the surrenders of both Shaftesbury and Wilton, and no doubt expected to work their will at Ambresbury. "We yesterday came," they say, "and communed with the abbess* for the accomplishment of the king's highness' commission in like sort. And albeit we have used as many ways with her as our poor wits could attain, yet in the end we could not by any persuasions bring her to any conformity. At all times she rested and so remaineth in these terms: 'If the king's highness command me to go from this house I will gladly go, though I beg my bread; and as for pension, I care for none.' In these terms she was in all her conversation, praying us many times to trouble her no further herein, for she had declared her full mind, in the which we might plainly gather of her words she was fully fixed before our coming." †

Four months went by, during which it is more than probable that pressure of every kind was brought to bear upon Florence Bonnerman, the staunch and fearless prioress. At the end of that time she announced to Crumwell her resignation "at the king's bidding." ‡ On the 23rd of the same

* A mistake for "prioress." Ambresbury was not an abbey.

† R. O. Crum. Corr., Vol. xliii., No. 69.

‡ *Ibid.*, i., 90.

month, one William Popley, whose sister, Dame Bridget, was a nun in the convent, wrote to ask for "a relaxation of certain injunctions," as his sister thought he "might preserve her ladies' suits."* The request had apparently little weight, for in December, 1539, Dr. London, John Ap Rice and others arrived at the convent and suppressed it. The successor of the intrepid Florence Bonnerman received a pension of £100 a year, one of the largest granted to any nun, and 33 of her sisters were also promised a pittance.† The name of the former prioress does not appear. No doubt she kept her word to go forth, "though I beg my bread." "As for pension," she had said, "I care for none," and none she received.‡

One other example of much the same pressure put upon a convent to fall in with the king's wishes, is furnished by the abbey of Godstow. This convent, in Oxfordshire, is well known as the place where fair Rosamond Clifford, the mistress of Henry II., passed her last years in penitence. The royal visitors had given it an excellent character; "where there was great strictness of life, and to which were most of the young gentlewomen of the county sent to be bred; so that the gentry of the country desired the king would spare the house."§

* *Ibid.*, xxxiv., 23.

† R. O. Exch. Aug. Off. Misc. Bk., 245, f. 98.

‡ It may be of interest to note about Ambresbury that upon its surrender "rewards" were given to 33 nuns, 4 priests and 33 servants. Pensions were granted to 35 nuns. *Ibid.*, Bk. 494, f. 31.

§ Burnet (1st ed.), i., p. 238.

On Tuesday, November 4th, 1539, that valiant visitor, Dr. London, appeared at the abbey to dismiss the nuns and take the possessions for the king. The following day Katherine Bulkeley, the abbess, wrote to Crumwell begging his protection. She had, as she says, "been appointed to her office through his influence, and up to that time had never been moved nor desired by any creature . . . to surrender and give up the house." She will do as the king commands, but she says, "I trust to God that I have never offended God's laws nor the king's, whereby this poor monastery ought to be suppressed. This notwithstanding, my lord, so it is that doctor London, which, as your lordship doth well know, was against my promotion, and hath ever since borne against me great malice and grudge, like my mortal enemy, is suddenly come unto me with a great rout with him, and here doth threaten me and my sisters, saying that he hath the king's commission to suppress the house, spite of my teeth. And when he saw that I was content that he should do all things according to his commission, and showed him plainly that I would never surrender to his hand, being my ancient enemy, now he begins to entreat me, and to inveigle my sisters one by one otherwise than ever I heard tell that any of the king's subjects hath been handled. And he here tarrieth and continueth to my great cost and charge, and will not take my answer, that I will not surrender till I know the king's gracious commandment or your good lordship's."

She adds that she will do what the king wants, but that it is not true that she has wasted the property of her house, as Dr. London told Crumwell.*

London's letter, written the following day, after saying that the abbess takes his coming "something pensively," adds that, while waiting for an answer, he intends to "something ripe" himself "in knowledge of the state of the house." And if the king insist on dissolving the house "notwithstanding her desire (to have a statement of) such considerations as moveth his grace, for the reformation of such abuses, to take the house by surrender," he begs that the nuns may be allowed suitable pensions. The abbess has had to borrow the money for payment of her "first-fruits," many of the nuns are old, and "few of the others have any friends." †

Crumwell sent his orders to let the house alone for a while. Then on November 26th the abbess wrote her thanks "for the stay of doctor London, who was here ready to suppress this poor house against my will and all my sisters, and had done it indeed if you had not sent so speedily contrary commandments." She adds that according to further orders she has handed over the "domains and stock" to "master doctor Owen," and that she is ready to go any lengths if the house may be spared. In fact, she assures her master that "there is neither pope, nor purgatory, image nor pilgrimage nor praying to dead saints used or regarded amongst" them,

* Wright, 229.

† *Ibid.*, 227.

and that they do not too much cling to "this garment and fashion of life." *

But even as Katherine Bulkeley penned this miserable surrender of her faith and principles, so she had some days before, on November 17th, 1539, surrendered her trust. Sir John Williams and others were sent down to effect the transfer of the convent property to the king, in place of her "old enemy" London, and they forwarded to Henry the deed of surrender which, however, was signed by none of the nuns. The abbess and fifteen nuns were promised pensions; three of them for the strange reason "because they cannot marry." †

Besides the trials incidental to the uncertainty of the fate which awaited them, the nuns, at this time deprived of the aid and direction of their spiritual superiors in the episcopate, ‡ must have suffered extremely. This the prioress of Wilton writes in so many words to Crumwell. "We stand and have done long," she says, "for lack of a head in great unquietness and danger, as God knoweth not only in the decay lack and disturbance of the service of God according to our religion, but also of the destruction and desolation of our monastery. We are so threatened by our ordinary, master doctor Haylley, that we know not what to do. He cometh

* R. O. Crum. Corr., xiv, 3.

† R. O. Exch. Augt. Office Misc. Bk., 245, f. 157.

‡ It will be remembered that the jurisdiction of the bishops over the monasteries had been suspended. See Vol. i., p. 253.

to us many times and among us as he says he does but order us after the law, but as God knoweth we are unlearned, and not wont to such law as he doth exercise amongst us. And because that we differ such matters as he would that we should consent to, the which as we suppose and think are not lawful, nor yet profitable to us or our house, he does sore and grievously threaten us. And he hath heretofore put us to great vexation and trouble and yet mindeth so to do and continue. He hath admitted to bear rule with us, in this our vacation* one Christopher Willoughby and another. This Christopher, for his subtle, crafty and false demeanour has been expelled first by dame Cecily Willoughby the abbess and then after, his service was utterly refused by Isabel Jordan our last abbess." †

Over the community at Stratford a superioress, or, as they preferred to call her, a "supposed prioress," had been appointed, who was the cause of great trouble in the community. "As soon as we speak to have anything remedied," they say, "she bids us go to Crumwell and let him help us. And the old lady, who is prioress in right, is like to die for lack of sustenance and good keeping for she can get neither meat, drink, nor money to help herself." The chancellor of the bishop of London, they complain, told them that the intruder should continue "in spite of our deaths and of their deaths that say nay to it.

* Vacancy of the office of abbess.

† R. O. Crum. Corr., Vol. li., No. 9.

He commanded her to look to us and to punish us, that all others may beware by us." . . . "Sir," they continue in their appeal to Crumwell, "it is not possible for us to continue in the manner that we be in now. Sir, the chancellor rebuked us, and said that we had got a temporal man over us for our ordinary and that he spake by you. But, our learned counsel, who we had before we put our matter to the king's grace, told us it was not lawful for him to be a chancellor, for he is not a priest, and hath no power to hear confession, nor yet to give absolution as he doth."*

Very few of the convents were rich enough to bring any great amount of spoil to the king. The plate, however, from Barking, the most ancient and venerable and almost the richest nunnery in England, the home of so many saints, which came into the royal hands in November, 1539, was a valuable prize. It consisted of over 3,000 ounces, the greater part being parcel gilt, besides what was found to be only copper gilt when broken. There was discovered here "a monstrance" weighing 65 ounces, enriched with a beryll and numbers of copes and other vestments of cloth of gold and tissue reserved for the king's use. Besides this, the goods of the abbey sold for nearly £200;† so small a sum in so wealthy a house shews the poverty actually observed by the religious.

* *Ibid.*, Vol. xli., Nos. 2, 4.

† R. O. Exch. Aug. Off. Mins. Accts., 31-32 Hen. VIII., 257, m. 5.

One circumstance with regard to the suppression of the Bridgettine house of Syon is worth recording. In one of Crumwell's interesting remembrances is the following item: "touching the monastery of Syon, the king may dissolve it by *premunire* as he will."* This power possessed by Henry over the convent arose from a singular circumstance. On May 29th, 1538, the attorney-general, in behalf of the king, had presented a bill of complaint against John Stokesley, bishop of London, who was brought up from the Marshalsea, where he had been in prison. The charge was, that on February 5th, 1537, he had, in the ceremony of professing Thomas Knotton, a brother of Syon, and Godfrey, a lay brother, under the obedience of John Copinger, the father confessor, made use of the form of profession approved of by pope Paul II. In acting thus, he publicly proclaimed the jurisdiction of the bishop of Rome, and made use of "papistical rites, cultus and ceremonies;" and by anyone after 31st July, 1536, upholding the authority of the bishop of Rome, as well as all aiders and abettors, the penalties of *premunire* had been incurred. Moreover, he had acted in the same way on two later occasions, and it was contended that both the bishop, Agnes Jordan, the abbess of Syon, and others had thus forfeited their property to the king. Stokesley confessed the bill, and was bound over to appear under a bail of 10,000 marks and the surety of several London

* R. O. State Papers, Dom., 1539, $\overline{\text{v}}$ 11

merchants.* And although Henry subsequently pardoned all concerned, his hand was upon the convent. In December, 1539, it passed, apparently without surrender, in his possession.

One word must be said as to the number of nuns who were turned adrift into the world on the destruction of their homes. Hooper, in a letter written in 1546 to Bullinger from Strasburg, says:—"He (the king) has caused all their (the monastic) possessions to be transferred into his exchequer; and yet they are bound, even the frail female sex, by the king's command to perpetual chastity. England has at this time at least 10,000 nuns, not one of whom is allowed to marry."† Such an estimate is obviously much exaggerated. The fact is, that allowing for the four or five convents about which some uncertainty exists, there do not appear to have been more than some 1,560 religious women in England at the time of the dissolution. Of these more than one-half, or some 850, belonged to the Benedictine Order.

* *Coram Rege*, 30 Hen. VIII. Easter, Rex Roll m. 20.

† *Original Letters*, Parker Society, No. 21.

CHAPTER VII.

FALL OF THE FRIARS.

THE autumn of 1538 witnessed the destruction of the English friaries. From the thirteenth century the mendicant orders had taken an important part in the religious life of the country. They were actuated by a different fundamental principle from that which was the mainspring of the monastic state. In the latter, whatever may have been the work the members of the great religious orders were at times called upon to undertake, the basis upon which they rested was conventual life and seclusion from the cares of even parochial matters, in order that their lives might be given up to the calmer service of the cloister. The principle that inspired the friars, on the other hand, was devotion to the external needs of the Church. In its primary conception, the ideal of a friar's life was to be found in the performance of active religious duties among the people. Untrammelled, on the one hand by the stricter traditions of the old monastic observance, and on the other by the petty exigencies of parochial management, they could devote their energies to the necessary duties of preaching and teaching. Their houses were built in or near great towns; but to the friar the convent was a very different

place to what it was to the monk. To the latter, from the day of his profession his monastery became his home, and the brethren gathered within its walls, his family; to the former the convent cell afforded but a temporary shelter in which to recruit his powers, physical and mental, for new labours in the cause of religion. He had no home, properly so called, as the monk had in his monastery, and his services could be claimed by no special place. His profession bound him to the general body of his brethren, not to any particular family. The friar was the itinerant preacher living to a great extent among the people and endeavouring to influence their religious views and practices by every means at his command. In the early days of their mission the mendicant friars achieved great and striking successes. The whole history of the Church does not present a parallel to the enthusiastic reception given by the people to the reforms they preached, and their popularity in England, almost down to the day of their suppression, is evinced by numerous gifts and testamentary dispositions in their favour.

In the sixteenth century the friaries throughout the country numbered some two hundred. Of these the followers of St. Francis had sixty, the Dominicans about fifty-three, the Austin friars forty-two, and the Carmelites six-and-thirty. The rest were held by the Trinitarians and other less important bodies of men. Of the four great orders of mendicant friars,

looking at them so far as England is concerned, the Dominicans, small though some of their churches may have been in country towns, ever preserved a certain dignity, and, so to speak, an aristocratic character. It would appear as though whilst retaining the canon's dress first worn by St. Dominic in the cathedral of Osma, they bore with it something of the pre-eminence which naturally attaches to the clergy. The Franciscans were the most popular, in the widest sense of the word, with high and low. The Carmelites were simple, homely, and spread through the country as if an order of native origin.

The two or three greatest houses of Franciscans, as London, or York, might vie whether in buildings or quantity of plate and richness of vestments with a Benedictine abbey of all but the first rank. The Carmelite houses and churches form a striking contrast. The church of so important a convent as Cambridge was furnished with a poverty, among these friars not incongruous with their profession, but of which the smallest parish church would have been ashamed. It is remarkable how prolific the English Carmelites were in writers, although it is not impossible that the number of their writers was not really greater than those of the Franciscans and Dominicans; but these latter orders lacked a Bale. For even Bale has a redeeming point in his literary character. He gathered up, whilst it was yet time, with scrupulous care the memorials of his

order in England, and thus showed, in spite of the violence and virulence of speech and pen, that there was somewhere in his heart a tenderness for the men of his old habit.*

The total number of friars is somewhat difficult to estimate, and can only be stated in general terms. From the list of names given in the "surrenders" and other documents it would appear that the average number of inmates in each Dominican friary was about nine, in each Franciscan about eleven, in each Augustinian about eight and in each Carmelite about nine. Taking these averages as approximately correct, it would appear that the total number of friars in England at the time of their dispersion was about eighteen hundred.† Richard Ingworth, the suffragan bishop of Dover, writing to Crumwell on April 1st, 1539, says that in the north of England he has received for the king twenty-six houses. In these there were "nine score friars;" but he adds that these were "the poorest houses that ever" he went to, and that the best houses had been undertaken by other visitors.‡ The average of seven, therefore, for the smaller houses given up to the bishop would seem to show that the estimate of eighteen hundred is not excessive.

* It is to be regretted that Bale's Carmelite collections in the Harleian MSS. at the British Museum (Nos. 3838, 7031, &c.) have not been printed.

† In the few years that preceded their final suppression a number of the friars had left the country rather than conform to Henry's regulations.

‡ R. O. Crum. Corr., viii., f. 115.

For some reason or other the various orders of friars had not been included in the dissolutions which had been carried out under the act for suppressing houses of less than £200 a year.* It is probable that as in accordance with their constitution they were possessed of very little real property, it did not suit the king's purpose to risk the unpopularity of attacking them when so little was to be gained by so doing. When, however, the royal policy of plunder had been firmly established, and the complete overthrow of the northern rising had rendered resistance almost impossible, Henry could contemplate the seizure of the friaries and the absorption of their trifling possessions into the regal revenues without fear of the consequences. Small as their belongings really were, still some few manors, farms and houses were to be got out of their wholesale destruction. Each convent, however poor, had the site upon which it stood ; and even if the plate in the sacrist's keeping was generally worth but a trifling sum, the lead on the roof and gutters of the church would add a few pounds to the grand total of these ecclesiastical spoils.

But although the friars had escaped for a time where others had fallen a prey, they had been harassed with many difficulties hardly less bearable than absolute extinction. They had been regarded,

* It is curious to note the mistakes into which some authors have fallen upon this point. More than one could be cited who state that these "lesser monasteries" were chiefly the houses of friars.

probably with a great amount of truth, as especially loyal to the pope. The troubles of the Observant friars, who had taken an active part in opposing the king's divorce, and the consequent breach with the Holy See, have been already dwelt upon. The other bodies of friars were, by the principle of their existence, less insular than the greater monastic orders. They formed part only of a vast army, which possessed battalions in every country, and which was governed by a supreme commander, dwelling in a foreign country, and generally beneath the very shadow of the papal throne. Their very poverty tended to make them independent of crown control. Possessed of no large estates, which in the case of the greater monasteries furnished the king with a title to interference in every election of abbot or prior, the friars were free to choose or accept an appointed superior without the king's consent or license.

This freedom from control had, early in the quarrel of the king with church, been put an end to by the appointment of an Augustinian friar, Dr. George Brown, as general over all the mendicant orders.* This new superior was a creature of Cromwell. He preached, according to Chapuys, under his master's inspiration against the pope and the old Catholic doctrine, and had been appointed to his office "in reward for having married the lady Anne" to the king. Of the work done by this instrument of

* Calendar, vii., 121.

Henry "in all things unlawful," and his assistant, the Dominican, John Hilsey, afterwards bishop of Rochester, in succession to the martyred Fisher, sufficient has already been said.* Under the terror of their visitation, the friars generally appear to have signed away their belief in papal supremacy, and accepted Henry as head of the Church in England.

In the work of suppressing the friaries Crumwell found an energetic lieutenant in Richard Ingworth, formerly prior of the Dominican house of Langley Regis. This house was the richest possessed by the Black friars, having an income of £125 a year, and on December 9th, 1537, Ingworth was consecrated suffragan bishop of Dover.† Very much about the same time he received two commissions "to visit and vex" his brother friars. In the first, power was bestowed upon him to depose or suspend incriminated superiors, and to appoint others in their places. In the second he is directed to visit their convents, to take possession of their keys, to sequester goods, and make indentures and inventories.‡ No mention is made of suppression, and such a work was apparently entirely beyond the powers granted either to him or other visitors,§ although their

* Vol. i., pp. 172-3.

† Stubbs' "Epis. Succession," p. 78.

‡ Wilkins, iii., 829, 835.

§ Canon Dixon, "Hist. of Church of England," ii., p. 37, says: "This was well contrived. If the visitors suppressed a house quietly, they were not complained of, though they exceeded their commission: the king pocketed the money. But if (which never happened) there had been a disturbance, the king and Crumwell

instructions quoted in the last chapter leave on the mind no doubt as to the royal intention.

In the time that elapsed from 1534, when the troubles of the reformation began, to the autumn of 1538, when the active suppression of the friars commenced, a considerable number of these religious evidently succeeded in leaving the country. Thus, rather than take the oath to hold Henry as head of the Church, the Franciscan Observants and others in the Island of Guernsey had given up their convent in September, 1537. "I have called unto me," writes a correspondent to Crumwell, "all the Friars Observant strangers which were left in the convent of the Friars Observant of saint Francis within the Isle of Guernsey" and ordered them immediately to take the required oath. They refused, and asked to be allowed to cross over "to Normandy their natural country," saying "they would rather forsake their convent and country than make" such an oath. The writer adds that he sent them over in a boat and took possession of their goods, an inventory of which he encloses.*

The way in which the number of friars was diminished before the final suppression of their convents may be illustrated by the house of Dominicans at Derby. Previous to 1534 the community consisted of about thirty religious. When were safe: they would have said that the visitors had exceeded their commission, and would have punished them exemplarily if public feeling had required a victim."

* Ellis, *Orig. Letts.*, ii., Series ii., p. 91.

Dr. London visited it in the January of 1539 he only obtained the signatures of some half-a-dozen. It is said on the highest authority that "a great part of the friar preachers of England in 1534-1535 withdrew from the country into Ireland, Scotland and Flanders"* rather than conform, and in consequence of the poverty to which they were reduced.

Some among the friars were bold enough to denounce the royal policy and to condemn even from the public pulpit the tendency of the "new learning." The prior of the Dominican friars of Newcastle-on-Tyne, not only refused to acknowledge the royal supremacy, but publicly preached against it. In the spring of 1536 he was in danger of his freedom and probably of his life. Unknown to his brethren he sought safety in flight, sending to his convent the following letter:—

TO THE FATHERS AND BRETHREN OF THE CONVENT OF BLACK FRIARS IN NEWCASTLE.—The cause of my writing to you is this time to show you that for fear of my life I am fled. For because of my preaching in Advent and also in Lent, the first Sunday, I am noted to be none of the king's friends, though albeit I love the king as a true Christian man ought to do. But, because I have not, according to the king's commandment, in my sermons both prayed for him as the supreme head of the Church, nor declared him in my sermons to be the supreme head of the Church, but rather contrary, I have declared St. Peter, the Apostle and his successors to be Christ's vicars upon earth of all the churches, some of one

* Rev C. R. F. Palmer, O.P., in the "Reliquary," Vol. xviii., p. 71. The volumes of this valuable periodical contain many communications from father Palmer's pen on the English Dominican Convents.

country and some of another. (This did I) the forenoon of the first Sunday. Of which words it followeth that the king cannot be the supreme head of the Church of England, but rather the successors of Saint Peter. I was also admonished to preach shortly in Newcastle and both to pray for him as supreme head and also so to declare him unto the people. This thing I cannot do lawfully: First, because it is against the Scripture of God taken in its true sense. Secondly, it is against the doctrine of the Church, Catholic and Apostolic, as it appeareth in the decrees, decretals, etc., which doctrine of Holy Church I was sworn openly in the University of Oxford to declare with all my power and ever to stick unto, and that I should never affirm anything, neither in the schools, nor in preaching, nor elsewhere that is contrary to the determination of the same Church, Catholic and Apostolic. Thirdly, it is against many general Councils. Fourthly, it is against the interpretation of all the holy doctors as Irenæus, Cyprian, Augustine, Jerome, etc. Fifthly, it is against all the Universities and general schools of all Christendom, except a few certain Universities lately corrupted and poisoned with Lutheran heresies. Sixthly, it is against the consent of all the Christian people who have received Peter's successors as supreme head of the Church Catholic ever more unto this time. Seventhly, it is against my profession which I made to be obedient to the master of the whole Order and successors according to the institutions of Friars Preachers, who in that evidently declared that "*ordo noster est S. Pontifici Romano immediate subjectus.*"

For these seven causes I cannot lawfully do as I am commanded by the king in his letters, neither as I was admonished by his servant and chaplain. Wherefore, I could not abide in England without falling under the king's indignation, which as the Scripture says is death—"Indignatio inquit principis mors est." Thus I have thought it better for me to fly and give place to ire as Christ commanded me to

do, and as both He and His disciples, with many good men hath done and daily doth, than I would tarry and preach false doctrine against my conscience; or yet to tarry and suffer death as others have done, for *Spiritus quidem promptus, caro autem infirma*. I am in heart well willing to die in these my opinions, notwithstanding I feel my flesh "grudge" with death. Wherefore, fathers and dear brethren all for these premises, by this present writing, I give up my office and request you to choose another prior. Secondly, I beseech you all to pray for me as your poor brother in Christ and now in Christ's cause departed from you. So committing myself to the (God) who ever save you all, as I would be saved myself, Amen.

Vester, RICHARD MARSHALL.*

Friar Marshall's fears for his safety were amply justified by the way in which every opposition to the royal schemes was punished. Even private conversations were reported by Crumwell's ubiquitous spies, and the speakers called to account. More especially was this the case after the overthrow of the northern insurgents had delivered Henry from all further dread of popular resistance. Thus, the vicar of Bradford in Wiltshire, William Bird, was attainted by act of parliament for saying to a kinsman of his who was summoned to fight against the northern men: "I am sorry therefor. Seest thou not how the king plucketh down abbeys and images every day." And for declaring the king on another occasion to be

* Calendar, x., 594. Printed *in extenso* by Fr. Palmer, in "Reliquary," Vol. xviii., p. 163. Richard Marshall escaped to Scotland. He was at St. Andrew's in 1551, when Fox says he publicly advocated "reasonable devotion by maintaining that the *Pater Noster* ought to be directed to God alone."

a heretic. Even lord Hungerford was attainted of treason for helping this priest "in his examination and retaining him as his chaplain."*

In the same way numerous charges were preferred against priests and others for their hostility to the royal supremacy and the general policy of Henry in ecclesiastical matters. In April, 1537, the popular discontent manifested itself in a serious way in Norfolk. Men met in the streets of Walsingham and "condemned the suppression of so many religious houses in which God was well served and many good deeds of charity done." One man said, "See how these abbeys go down and our living goeth away with them. For within a while Burnham shall be put down and also Walsingham and all other abbeys in this country. And further he said that the gentlemen there had all the farms and all the cattle in the country in their hands, so that poor men could have no living by them. And, therefore, quoth (he), when these men shall come to put down the abbeys some men must step to and resist them." "I hear say," said another, "that all the abbeys in the country shall go down." "More pity if it pleased God," cried a third.†

* Rot. Parl., 32 Hen. VIII., 59. Lord Walter Hungerford was executed on Tower Hill on 28th July, 1540, the same day on which lord Crumwell was beheaded. By a letter from lord Walter Hungerford to Crumwell (R. O. Crum. Corr., xviii., 14) it is evident that William Bird was charged with high treason for speaking against the king's supremacy.

† R. O. State Papers, Dom., 1537, $\frac{7}{17}$, $\frac{7}{16}$.

The late experience of the northern rebellion had taught the king the necessity of prompt action. Some thirty or forty men of the district were seized and tried. They were charged with saying "that if they could get any company they would make an insurrection as well for the staying of the abbeyes putting down, as for reformation of gentlemen for taking of farms." Their object was to take Lynn and to seize and fortify Thetford and Brandon bridges. A special commission sitting at Norwich Castle on May 22, 1537, tried and found them guilty.* Amongst them were John Grigby, rector of the Church of Langham, two Augustinian canons of Walsingham, Nicholas Myleham and Richard Vowell, a cleric of Walsingham, William Younger, and two Carmelite friars of Burnham Norton, William Gybson and John Pecock. Friar Gybson was condemned to perpetual imprisonment,† together with another cleric, John Punte, rector of the parish church of Waterlow. This latter was specially charged with having approved the action of the others by saying, "Peradventure what they did was for the commonwealth."‡

Of the rest, twelve were executed at different towns in Norfolk. Amongst these were George Gysborough, Ralph Rogerson and William Gysborough, whose avowed condemnation of the destruction of the

* *Coram Rege*, 29 Hen. VIII., Hilary, m. 2.

† *Controlment Roll*, 29 Hen. VIII., m. 33d.

‡ *Coram Rege*, *ut sup.* These two were afterwards pardoned ("Rot. Pat.," 29 Hen. VIII., Pars. i., m. 9.).

religious houses has been quoted above, and two religious; the Augustinian canon Mileham, executed at Walsingham on Wednesday, May 30th, and the Carmelite friar Pecock, who suffered at Lynn on Friday, June 1st, 1537.* The terror inspired by the constant accusations, trials, convictions and cruel executions of those guilty only of verbal treason, or of expressing disapproval of the king and his actions, bore down all opposition. None was safe. As one man who was accused and examined expressed it, "If two or three good fellows be walking together, the constables come to them and will know what communication they have or else they shall be stocked."†

The case of another friar, Anthony Brown, who was condemned to death in the summer of 1538 for his belief in the old doctrine of papal supremacy, may be here briefly referred to, before passing on to relate the circumstances of the general dissolution of the friaries. The duke of Norfolk, writing to Crumwell on August 4th, 1538, told him that the justices of assize lately sitting at Norwich had before them "one called Anthony Brown, some time a friar Observant of Greenwich and of late taking upon him as a hermit." He wrote out "his own confession with his hand which," says the duke, "you shall receive with this." The friar was found guilty,

* R. O. Crumwell Corresp., xxxix., 72.

† R. O. State Papers, Dom., 1537, $\frac{7}{11}$. Confession of Richard Bishop, of Bungay.

“giving respite to the sheriff for his execution ten days following, which they showed me the said duke, they did for this consideration, which was they thought it convenient that a sermon should be made by the bishop of Norwich, as was by the bishop of Worcester at the execution of Forest.”

The views of the bishop of Norwich were apparently considered doubtful, and it was thought well that Norfolk should thus make trial of both the friar and him. “And because,” continues the duke, “Mr. Townsend is the only one of the king’s council in these parts, I sent in likewise for him to be present at all the examinations. And this afternoon we so handled the said friar that we brought him to this point, that he would not stick upon the authority of the bishop of Rome to be supreme head of the Church, but in no wise could we bring him from the opinion that the king ought not to be supreme head of the Church, saying that no temporal prince was *capax* of that name and authority.” Neither “Dr. Call, a Grey friar,” who was present and took the king’s part, nor the bishop of Norwich, who argued well on the point, could move the friar. And so “we have delivered him,” continues Norfolk, “to the sheriff to be carried to the gaol and there to suffer according to his foolish doings upon Friday next. Before his death the said bishop shall make such a sermon as we trust shall be to the king’s highness contentation and apparent to the people (who, we think, will be there in great number) that this unhappy foolish

friar is well worthy to suffer and that his opinions be false and untrue. My lord, the cause of the sending of this man in so great haste unto you is because that if the king's majesty and you shall think it convenient to have him to be brought to the Tower, there to be more straightly examined and to be put to torture, you may despatch this bearer or some other with command to the sheriff accordingly, so that the same may be with him at Norwich by Friday at ten o'clock."

"After writing," the bishop of Norwich tried once more to induce the friar to change his opinions, but without success. As the duke expresses it, "yet finally he persisted in his errors,"* and though an actual record of the execution has not been found, there can be little doubt that the sentence of death was carried out on Friday, August 9th, 1538.

The various dissolutions of religious houses and desecration of churches, which had been witnessed in all parts of England from the spring of 1536, had a disastrous but natural effect on the friaries. These religious were almost entirely dependent upon the alms of the faithful for their support, and one immediate result of the royal seizure of ecclesiastical property was to dry up the spring of charity given for religious purposes. It could hardly be supposed that donations would be given for objects marked out for destruction and which would only go to swell the total amount of the royal plunder.

* Ellis, *Orig. Lett.*, i., Ser. ii., p. 86.

There were exceptions, of course, to the general rule, and there are instances of donations being given to the friars on the very eve of their dispersion. Thus, on October 9th, 1537, just fifteen months before the surrender, Robert Davell, arch-deacon of Northumberland, made an interesting covenant with friar Roland Harding, the successor of Richard Marshall at the Black friars, Newcastle. The Dominican brethren promised that "between six and nine o'clock in the morning daily, before the picture of our Lord, called the crucifix, which was between the cloisters and the outer door of the choir within the church, the friars kneeling, would sing devoutly the anthem of the cross, beginning '*O crux,*' with the versicle *Adoramus te Christe Jesu Fili Dei vivi,* etc., and the collect of the same, *Domine Jesu,* etc. And after then (they were) devoutly to say, for the souls of William Davell and John Brigham, late of Newcastle, merchant, their wives and children, with their benefactors and all Christian souls, the *De profundis* with the *preces* belonging, ending with the oratio *Absolve.* In return of all which Robert Davell gave the friars £6 8s. in their great need. And the friars agree that if the anthem and prayers were not sung for two days, they would sing a solemn dirge with mass of Requiem by note, sending the bellman round the town to notify the same in order that the people might come to the friars and make an offering for the souls. And if none of the premises were

observed, truly and without delay the £6 8s. should be refunded."*

The very terms of this contract would show, were there not ample evidence of the fact, that by this time the friars had been reduced to a state of extreme poverty. In fact it is impossible to read the letters of bishop Ingworth and doctor London to Crumwell whilst they were engaged in the work of suppressing the friaries without seeing that their poverty left them no alternative but surrender. "Since that I last was with you," writes the former, "I have received to the king's use twelve houses of friars: that is one in Huntingdon, four in Boston, four in Lincoln, one in Grantham, one in Newark and now one in Grimsby. They all were in poverty, and little left, scarce to pay the debts and in some places not so much as £3 or (so). In these houses the king's grace shall have but the lead, which I think in all twelve houses shall be, as I can judge it, about twelve score foddors or more and twenty-four bells, such as they be; and of every house a chalice of six to ten ounces apiece, in some places more. These chalices I bear with me, and other silver if I find it."† So, too, according to the same authority the three houses of friars at Canterbury were all in debt. The Austin friars particularly owed £40, while all their belongings, exclusive of plate, which

* Brand's "Newcastle," quoted by Fr. Palmer. "*Reliquary*," Vol. xviii., p. 164.

† R. O. Crum, *Corr.*, viii., f. 112.

the bishop estimated at eighty-five ounces, would not fetch £6.* In the twenty-six houses of friars in the north which he dissolved in the first months of 1539, he obtained little except the worth of the sacred vessels.† It is the same story wherever this episcopal commissioner goes. At Dunstable, Ware, Walsingham and innumerable other houses the goods are reported as "some sold, some stolen and some pledged," so that little was left either in plate, lead or other implements,‡ while at Scarborough the three houses were so impoverished as to be obliged to sell the very stalls from their church and the screenwork, "so that nothing is left but stone and glass," and all that the king can expect to get is the lead off the roof and "very poor chalices."§

The testimony of the redoubtable Dr. London, to whom much of the work of dispatching the friars was committed, is to the same effect. At Northampton the Carmelites were so much in debt that all they had would not pay it off. The friars of Aylesbury were in the same plight. Dr. London thought their ornaments "very coarse" and sold them all with "the glass windows and their utensils."|| Thus, with few exceptions, if any, the friars throughout England had fallen into a state of

* *Ibid.*, 114.

† *Ibid.*, 115.

‡ *Ibid.*, 117.

§ *Ibid.*, 120. The letters of the bishop, printed by Wright, pp. 191-200, tell the same tale as to the poverty of the friars at this time.

|| *Ibid.*, xxiii., 81. See also London's letters printed by Wright.

poverty, which rendered their continuance almost an impossibility.

The chief object of bishop Ingworth, London and other royal agents was to force the alternative of submission upon the unwilling friars. "Good my lord," writes the bishop to his master, "I beseech you think not that I am any feigner to you, for I assure you I am not, but am and will be as true and as secret to you as any servant that you have. . . . I would do all things with so much quiet and without any clamour so near as I know; if I knew your pleasure, there shall be no part left undone so near as I may. My commission giveth me no authority to put any out, without they give up their houses, but if I knew your pleasure, I may find causes sufficient to put them out of many places for their misliving and for disobeying the instructions and the king's acts."* "Divers of the friars," he writes again, "are very loath to forsake their houses, and yet they are not able to live," as their debts are so great all they have will not pay them.†

At Gloucester, as the memorandum of the mayor records, Ingworth gave the friars their choice either to "continue in their houses and keep their religion and injunctions according to the same," which, be it remembered, were framed for the purpose of making religious life impossible, "or else to give their houses unto the king's hands." The mayor considered the injunctions "reasonable," and even the

* Wright, 200.

† R. O. Crum. Corr., viii., f. 127.

friars confessed "that they were according to their rules, yet as the world is now they were not able to keep them and live in their houses, wherefore voluntarily they gave their houses into the visitor's hands to the king's use. The visitor said to them," continues the declaration, "Think not, nor hereafter report not that you are suppressed, for I have no such authority to suppress you, but only to reform you, wherefore if ye will be reformed according to good order ye may continue," as far as I am concerned. They, however, confessed that they could not remain on the terms offered them, and so "the visitor took their houses and charitably delivered them and gave them letters to visit their friends and so to go to other houses with which they were content."*

The fact is that the methods adopted were admirably conceived to force compliance to the royal will. When the chief source of their revenue, the charity of the faithful, had been cut off, the only means left to the friars to secure sufficient to live upon were sales of their effects or leases of the little property they possessed. For both the free use of their corporate seal was required, and the first design of the visitor was to secure possession of this, and thus cut them off from any possibility of raising money. "In every place," says the bishop of Dover, "is jewels selling and other shift by leases. But in all these places I have set stay by making indentures and

* Wright, 202.

sequestering the common seals, so that now they have no shift to make." By this means "I think before the year is out there shall be very few houses able to live, but (they) will be glad to give up their houses and provide for themselves otherwise, for there they shall have no living." He then goes on to speak of the same two houses in Gloucester, from which he wrote, and the surrender of which has been recorded above. Of these he says, "I think there be two houses that will give up, for they have no living."*

In some of the houses, however, bishop Ingworth did not have it all his own way. He thus relates his experience at the house of Austin friars at Canterbury: "Being there the 14th day of December (1538), one friar there very rudely and traitorously used him before all the company, as by a bill here enclosed ye shall perceive. I seeing his demeanour straight sequestered him so that none spake with him. I sent for the mayor, and before he came I examined him before master Spylman and also afterwards before the mayor and master Spylman, and at all times he still held and still desired to die for it, that the king may not be head of the Church of England, but that it must be a spiritual father appointed by God. Wherefore I required of master

* Wright, 193. In another communication he says that in "all places" he has been to he has "sealed up the common seals, so that they shall sell or alienate no more of their jewels nor other stuff, wherefore I am sure that within a year the more part shall be fain to give up their houses for poverty."—*Ibid.*, p. 202.

mayor to have horses and men to send him to you, charging both the men that no man should speak with him."*

At the Austin friars at Droitwich also bishop Ingworth found in the prior's coffer "eleven bulls of the bishops of Rome and above a hundred letters of pardons, and in all the books in the choir the bishop of Rome still standing as he did twenty years past." The prior had been only a year in the office when the bishop arrived, but he had already "felled and sold seven score good elms, a chalice of gilt of 90 ounces, a censer of twenty-six ounces, two great brass pots each able to seeth a whole ox, as men say, spits, pans and other things, so that in the house is not left a bed, a sheet, a platter or dish." For all this, the writer adds, "I have charged the bailiffs that he shall be forth coming."†

* R. O. Crum. Corr., viii., f. 114. This was probably friar Stone, who was executed at Canterbury about this time. The following account of the expenses incurred by the city in carrying out the sentence may be here quoted from the city records:—

"A.D. 1538-9.—Paid for half a ton of timber to make a pair of gallaces (gallows) to hang Friar Stone. For a carpenter for making the same gallows and the dray. For a labourer who digged the holes. To four men that helped set up the gallows. For drink to them. For carriage of the timber from stable gate to the dungeon. For a hurdle. For a load of wood, and for a horse to draw him to the dungeon. For two men who set the kettle and parboiled him. To two men who carried his quarters to the gate and set them up. For a halter to hang him. For two halfpenny halters. For sandwich cord. For straw. To the woman that scoured the kettle. To him that did execution, 4s. 4d."—(Hist. MSS. Comm., 9th Rept., Append. p. 153, "City of Canterbury Records.")

† Wright, 195. Other friars at this time got into difficulties.

But with all his activity, bishop Ingworth was hardly the kind of man that the king's work required. Although he evidently from the first appreciated that the purpose of his commission was to drive the friars to surrender or abandon their houses, still he seems to have thought that some might be spared. He hesitated to desecrate the church of the friars at Droitwich, and appointed a friar to continue to say mass there, even although sir John Russell wanted the place and two other magnates of the county were making suit to the king and Crumwell for it.* The latter wrote him a sharp rebuke, and in his humble reply Ingworth says he shall act now that he knows his master's mind. "And where it hath pleased your lordship," he says, "to write to me, as ye judge, that though I have changed my habit I have not changed my friar's heart, good my lord, judge me not so. For God shall be my judge, my friar's heart

Sir Peter Egerton, for example, wrote to Crumwell that he had sent to Launceston gaol a "priest secular and two late friars priests." The secular "Andrew Furlong priest and schoolmaster at Saltash, Co. Cornwall, was sent by me to gaol," he says . . . "for this cause, there was a Bible of his found in his chamber. In the beginning thereof were three or four leaves cancelled and blotted out in such a manner that no man could read the same." Also "John Hunt and Robert Ellis, late Grey friars of Plymouth, by the confession and handwriting of the said Hunt, said to one that questioned them when they were put out of the Grey friars whether they would buy them new habits or not, and they both said that they would not for a year or two, and by that time perchance there would be another change." For this they were sent to gaol (*R. O. Crum. Corr.*, x., f. 26).

* Wright, 195.

was gone two years before my habit, saving only my living. But the favour I have shown has not been for my friar's heart, but to bring all things with the most quiet to pass. And also till now that your letter came to me I never could perceive anything of your pleasure, but ever feared that if I were too quick, that I should offend your lordship." He then goes on to edify Crumwell with some general accusations, which he thinks "would not a little have moved" his lordship,* and which are well-nigh the only suggestion of evil living the bishop makes against the friars in the whole of his many letters.

He quickly amends his method of dealing with the religious, and although he had previously given leave to his brother of St. Dominic's order, the prior of the Black friars, Winchester, "to say mass" in his old church till further notice, on the receipt of Crumwell's letter he wrote "to avoid him thence." At the end of his career, in August, 1539, he wrote, however, to beg that a house of his own order in Shrewsbury might be allowed to continue. On August 27th, 1539, he sent to beg Crumwell not to grant such a thing, for although he "could find no great cause in them to cause them to give up,"† still he thought their "standing" would give him greater "business in divers places than (he) should have." He was specially thinking of the Franciscans and Austin friars of Bristol, who "are stiff and bear themselves sore by (the) great favour" in which they are.‡ The following day

* *Ibid.*, 199.† *Ibid.*, 204.‡ *Ibid.*, 211.

he returned to the subject. "I have left," he says, "but one convent standing, and that is (the) Black friars of Shrewsbury. For this there will be great suit made to you to have it stand still, and that specially by one of the bailiffs, master Adam Hamilton, who, as he saith, is much bound to your lordship. For your sake he made me great cheer. Yet for all that, I would that he had some pleasure, but not that pleasure."* Before Michaelmas the friars, who had been left in their house by the bishop, were dispossessed.

The suppression was, of course, not finally carried to a conclusion without some severe handling. Instances of such measures have been noticed. No record, doubtless, was kept of much of the suffering endured by the friars before they were finally dispersed, but the glimpse that is afforded by the records of this period is sufficient to show that the most extreme measures were resorted to. Robert Buckenham, a member of the Dominican Order, was attainted of high treason and condemned to death for promulgating the "venomous serpent the bishop of Rome to be supreme head of the Church."† He, however, escaped out of Henry's power. Another friar, William Storme, was kept in the Fleet prison for "honouring images and maintaining the use of pilgrimages."‡ And Robert

* R. O. Crum. Corr., viii., 130.

† R. O. Rot. Parl., Hen. VIII., 147, No. 15.

‡ R. O. Crum. Corr., xl., 67. Dr. London writes about a "Black friar" who had been put in prison at Northampton at

Southwell, writing to Crumwell, informs him of the condemnation of a Franciscan for maintaining or remaining staunch to the old Catholic doctrine of papal supremacy. "Pleaseth it your good lordship to understand that William Dickinson, clerk and priested in Rome, with William Petty, sometime a friar minor in Jersey, were yesterday attainted of high treason upon their several denying the king's supremacy. In this they stuck as arrogantly as any traitors that I have much seen in my life and more would have done if they might have been permitted thereto. Surely, sir," he continues, "they were and yet be two weeds not meet to grow in our garden, nor none of their seed that they have sown, whereof we can as yet learn nothing by their confession. Dickinson was apprehended by the seaside in Sussex in journey towards Rome if he had not been stayed. Petty is subtly witted as he is ingenious and hath as pleasant an instrument for the utterance of his cankered heart as I have heard." He concludes by desiring to know "the king's pleasure concerning the time of the execution of these two traitors that be attainted."*

The character of Dr. London was more fitted than that of his fellow, bishop Ingworth, for the rough work he was called upon to do in the suppression of the friars' houses. He had, as his letters give ample

"All-Hallowes" and was there still on January 27. His offence was "certain words."

* Ellis, "Orig. Letters," iii., Ser. iii., 95.

evidence, no scruple to perform any act of vandalism necessary to the complete wrecking of friaries which had been built up by the patient toil and the means furnished by the Christian self-sacrifice of generations of pious benefactors, and for the desecration of churches for centuries dedicated to the service of God. At Reading he says, "I did only deface the church, all the windows being full of friars, and left the roof and walls whole for the king's use. I sold the ornaments and the cells in their dormitory." . . . At Aylesbury "I only did deface the church." So, too, at Bedford and Stamford. At Coventry he partly razed the house of the Franciscans, "because the poor people lay so sore upon it." At Warwick he only smashed in the windows of "the friars' church," and added in his account to Crumwell, "I never pulled down any house entirely, but so defaced them that they could not be used again."

Of the friars themselves we hear but little from this valiant destroyer. That little, as may be expected, is not complimentary in its character. The prior of the Austin friars at Northampton is untruthful, "like a very friar;" but when all is over he has to confess that the town of this same Northampton and the villages round about are falling into decay, a good deal of which is attributed to the destruction of the friaries.* The warden of the Grey friars at Reading was, as London says, "a friend of mine," which probably

* R. O. Crum. Corr., xxiii., 69-96.

will not be accounted much to his credit. This friar "also desired me," the doctor writes, "to be a humble suitor for him and his brethren that they may, with your lordship's favour, also change their garments with their papistical manner of living. The most part of them are very aged men and not of strength to go much abroad for their livings, wherefore their desire is that it may please your lordship to be a mediator unto the king's grace for them that they might during their lives enjoy their chambers and orchard."* A fortnight later (September 13th, 1538) London says that he has got the surrender, "and this day they all shall change their grey coats. Of friars," he adds, "they be noted here honest men." And after a description of the house and grounds he says, "the inward part of the church, thoroughly decked with Grey friars as well as in the windows as otherwise I have defaced."†

Of the friars' houses at Oxford he gives some special information. The commission to visit them consisted of the mayor, "master aldermen" and the doctor himself. They first went to the Carmelites. Here he found that the friars, in anticipation of their dissolution, had sold an annuity of £3 their house had from the abbot of Evesham, for £40 and divided the money. They were on the point of disposing of a similar annuity paid from the abbey of Westminster.‡ Moreover, their little land was all let on a

* Wright, 217.

† R. O. Crum. Corr., xxiii., 94.

‡ These instances are interesting as showing how the great abbeys helped the poorer friaries.

thirty years' lease. Their ornaments, "as copes and vestments," Dr. London considered "pretty" and these he took. The rest of their belongings he thought not worth £5 the lot. At the Augustinians all the trees had been felled. The Franciscans had good lands, woods and a "pretty garden." The house was large and ruinous, and they had been obliged to pawn most of their plate. Even the lead pipes of their conduit had been lately dug up "and cast into 68 sows," twelve of which had been "sold to pay the expenses of taking up," but the rest the indefatigable doctor secured and "put into safe custody." He adds that the wind had lately blown down many of the trees, and, worse than all, the "house is roofed with slate and not with lead." At the Dominicans they were more fortunate. "They have behind their house," he reports, "divers islands well-wooded" and, although their convent was only covered with slate, the choir, "which was lately built, was covered with lead." Their plate also was valuable, especially a great "chalice of gold set with jewels, worth more than a hundred marks."*

After what has been so far said about the state to which the friaries had been reduced by the middle of 1538 there is little need to dwell upon the surrenders which were extracted from them. The chief object of a formal document was to secure to the crown the legal possession of the property belonging to the religious corporation, and for this purpose the deed

* *Ibid.*, 77.

was, as a rule, carefully entered on the "close roll." As the friars possessed real property so slight in amount the "surrender" was of comparatively minor importance, and out of the two hundred convents of friars only some forty-five official deeds are known to exist. Of these more than a fourth are not found enrolled, several have not been dated, and some not legalized by the convent seal. In the case of one, that of the Franciscans of Aylesbury, although the convent apparently consisted of fifteen members, the signatures of only seven are attached to the document. Besides these forty-five, a book of surrenders made to bishop Ingworth seems to contain the signed resignations of some five-and-twenty more, none of which are sealed documents or have been enrolled.

The form of surrender employed in many cases is curious. After stating that the act was altogether voluntary, the document proceeds to say that the house is resigned into the king's hands under the conviction that the religious who sign it have been guilty of crimes and vices. The same form is made use of in a great many instances,* and chiefly where doctor London was engaged in the work. And although the document has often been pointed to as proof that the religious themselves confessed the iniquity of their lives, no reasonable man can doubt that, like other so-called "confessions," † this was a

* *e.g.*, Stamford, Franciscans and Carmelites; Bedford and Aylesbury, Coventry, etc.

† As to these, see Vol. i., p. 349, *et seq.*

ready-made document. The words of the surrender of Stamford, usually referred to in this matter, may be taken as a sample here. "Forasmuch," runs this document, "as we, the warden and friars of the house of St. Francis, Stamford, commonly called the Grey friars in Stamfords, etc., do profoundly consider that the perfection of Christian living doth not consist in dumb ceremonies, wearing the grey coat, disguising ourselves after strange fashions, 'decking and becking,' in girding ourselves with a girdle full of knots and other like papistical ceremonies wherein we have been most principally practised and misled in times past; but the very true way to please God and to live a true Christian man without all hypocrisy and feigned dissimulation, is sincerely declared unto us by our Master, Christ, His Evangelists and apostles. Being minded therefore to follow the same; conforming ourselves unto the will and pleasure of our supreme head under God in earth, the king's majesty, and not to follow henceforth the superstitious traditions of any 'forincycall' potentate or power, with mutual assent and consent, do submit ourselves unto the mercy of our said sovereign head," etc.* Were there any doubts as to the authorship of such documents left on the mind after examining their terms, they must be removed by the knowledge that there exists a draft of a surrender couched in a similar form, written in the hand of doctor London, and intended for the Carmelite friars of Oxford.†

* Fuller (Ed. 1837), ii., 223.

† R. O. State Papers, Dom., 1538, ⁸⁶160.

How far this was to be a voluntary act may be understood from a letter written by the doctor on July 7th, 1538: "We find," he says, "the white friars (these Carmelites) and the Augustins to be most out of order and brought into such poverty, that if they do not forsake their houses, their houses will forsake them, wherefore we are well onward in such order with them as they shall put themselves and their houses in the king's hands." At the end of this communication he says: "If Mr. Fryer, now newly come from London, had not said in the Blackfriars that he heard say in London that the four orders in Oxford and Cambridge should stand, the Black had made their submission yesterday. The Grey and Augustins have done it already under their writings and seals."* It was thus, according to London's own admission, only when the friars were given plainly to understand that they must go that their voluntary submission was executed. A rumour that they might be allowed to remain caused them to hesitate and draw back.

Some, no doubt, were willing to acknowledge anything to secure some slight pittance on which to live after the fall of their houses. Thus the warden of the London Franciscans, Thomas Chapman, one of the very few friars who secured the grant of a pension,† declared that if people were offended at "the coat we wear and the fashion (of life) that

* *Ibid.*, v. 188.

† R. O. Aug. Off. Misc. Bk., 249, f. 25, a grant of £13 6s. 8d.

some of us use," then as it was not "a thing *de necessitate salutis æternæ*" it should be given up. He further says he believes that there was not one in the house of Grey friars in London that would not "gladly change his coat so that he had a living provided as he had now."*

The spoils obtained for the royal treasury by the suppression of the friars were in the first instance very small. Beyond the plate seized for the king, which was seldom more than the sacred vessels, often only one chalice, a few shillings, or at most a few pounds, represented the amount credited to the king after the expenses of the commissioners had been paid. Thus at Pontefract the goods sold amounted, in the Dominican friary, to only 110s. 4d., all the furniture of "the cells" fetching but eight shillings. Prior Day was given thirteen shillings and fourpence and each priest five shillings. Sixty-two shillings was the balance obtained by the king, besides a little amount of lead, two bells, "a conduit and a brass 'hallywalter fatt'" left in the keeping of the mayor.†

At Newcastle, to take but one instance more, bishop Ingworth sold the vestments and other moveables in the Black friars house and church for less than £5; the mayor bought the tiles of the roof and everything in the dormitory for ten shillings; two chalices, weighing 38 ounces, were sent to the

* B. Mus. Cott. MS. Cleop., E. iv., f. 38.

† Fr. Palmer in "The Reliquary," xx., p. 73.

royal treasure house; the lead was melted into 18 fadders, and the episcopal visitor went away with thirty shillings as the price obtained by all the desecration and ruthless destruction. As for the community, six shillings and eightpence was given to the prior, five shillings to two other priests, to two lay brothers three and fourpence each, and to another, Robert Burrall, who did not sign the surrender, as much as ten shillings. The bishop "gave them a few hours' grace to quit their convent," and turned them out in the depth of winter without any other provision.*

From some of the other friars' houses Henry obtained, if possible, even less. Thus from the four convents of Norwich the receiver only acknowledged forty-nine shillings, from the same at Yarmouth only sixty-seven, and from the Black friars at Thetford little more than a pound.†

A memorandum as to the Carmelites of Bristol states that four friars came before the mayor attended by the bishop of Dover and acknowledged that "they had voluntarily left their house." Their plate had been sold, and yet they were in debt, "and as the charity of the people is," they say, "very small, it is impossible for them to live." They stated that the royal commissioner "had given them all their own chambers and all the books of the choir and divers other small implements; and to each of them

* *Ibid.*, xviii., 165.

† R. O. Exch. 31-32 Hen. VIII., 255, m. 9.

a letter and twenty pence in their purses to bring to their convents and gave them certain times to visit their friends."* The reference here and elsewhere to "the convents" to which these friars were ultimately to go, seems to suggest that they were deluded as to the ultimate intentions of Henry in his wholesale suppressions. No wonder some were loath to go. "There was an ancre," writes Ingworth, of Worcester, "with whom I had not a little business to have her grant to come out: but out she is."† This in one short sentence is a fair representation of the spirit in which the expulsion of the friars was conducted.

As to the sites and buildings, the crown, no doubt, made a great deal of profit by the sales of these. Situated in the heart of great towns, the space, and even the actual buildings, were much sought after. Thus, "in Lincoln," writes the bishop of Dover, "in the Grey friars is a goodly conduit, for which the mayor and the aldermen were with me to make suit to have the conduit into the city."‡ So, too, the mayor and aldermen of Grimsby wanted Ingworth to beg the friars' house "to make of it a common house for ordnance and other necessaries for the defence of the king's enemies if need be." It "stands very well," said his lordship, "for the purpose, near the water and open on the sea." And the thing asked he believes is "very necessary for the common-

* R. O. Chapt. H. Bk., B. 1^o, p. 19.

† Ellis, "Orig. Letters," ii., Ser. viii., No. 127. ‡ Wright, 102.

wealth.”* In Reading also the town wished for the church of the Grey friars to make a town hall of it, and in several places the buildings were purchased by the cities in which they were situated. Thus in December, 1539, the king sold to the inhabitants of Worcester the sites, lands, churches, belfries and bells, churchyards and other belongings of the convents of the Black and Grey friars there for £541 10s,† and this was after the superfluous buildings had been sold by men who took four days over the job at a cost of seventy-eight shillings and eightpence.

It is necessary to say a few words about the sad lot of the disbanded friars. Only one or two individuals were granted any pension for their support. As a rule a few shillings (on an average apparently about five shillings) was delivered to each one on being turned out into the world to find their own living as best they might. Even when they secured what is known as a “capacity”—that is, permission to act as one of the secular clergy—employment was by no means easy to be obtained. The bishops were no lovers of the wandering friars, and the destruction of so many churches diminished the possibility of obtaining any cure of souls, even had they been willing to present them to any. This is evident in many letters of the period. I beg your lordship, wrote Ingworth to Crumwell, “to be good

* R. O. Crum. Corr., viii., f. 112.

† Rot. Pat., 31 Hen. VIII., p. 1, m. 28.

lord for the poor friars' capacities. They are very poor and can have little service without their capacities. The bishops and curates are very hard to them, without they have their capacities."* In another letter he says, "I pray you be good lord to me, that the warrants for their habits may be had according to my promise, for they (the friars) may not be suffered to say mass abroad in churches till they have their exemptions. I have written to divers of the bishops and with divers I have spoken to license them till after Michaelmas, and at that time I have promised to send their license to certain places where they shall have them free, for the most part of them have no penny to pay for the charge of them."†

Lastly, to give but one more instance of the hardship to which the expelled friars were exposed, another letter of the same bishop Ingworth, who was instrumental in producing such misery, may be quoted. "Further my good lord," he writes, "in these parts within the diocese of York the poor men (the disbanded friars) that surrender their houses are hardly ordered by the bishop's officers at the bishop's commandment. They cannot be suffered to sing nor say in any parish church without they show the letters of their orders, my letters or their capacities notwithstanding. And, the charge for these letters of their orders be so great, that the poor men be not able to bear it. Some must go a hundred miles to

* Wright, 193.

† *Ibid.*, 210.

seek them. And when they come there, the charge of searching the register is so great that they are not able to pay it, and so they come home again confounded. I have been with my lord of York and showed him your lordship's letter, that your commandment is that they who have surrendered their houses should be suffered without interruption to sing and say in any church. The bishop made many objections and said that it must be known whether they were priests or not. And I certified him that we who received the houses made due search which were priests and which were not and so made certificate to your lordship and your lordship to the king's grace. So that by that means (only) their capacities were granted. Wherefore I desired him to accept their capacities from the king's grace with as much favour as the bishop of Rome's capacities had been before received, for which there never was any search made." Still, Ingworth does not think archbishop Lee was satisfied, and he begs that Crumwell will write his directions that these men may "sing and say" mass without having to show "any proof of orders." *

* R. O. Crum. *Corr.*, viii., 120.

CHAPTER VIII.

PROGRESS OF THE GENERAL SUPPRESSION.

THE story of one dissolution is practically, as to the general circumstances attending the work, the history of all. The steps of the royal commissioners engaged in disbanding monks, in destroying what were accounted superfluous buildings, and in sweeping the spoils into the king's treasure-house, have been so closely followed by an eminent historian* that little need be said here as to the mere sequence of events which culminated in the total extinction of the monastic body in England.

For a year after the "Pilgrimage of Grace" few dissolutions, except some of the lesser monasteries previously doomed by act of parliament, are recorded. The only exceptions were those houses seized by Henry on account of the attainder of their superiors for their supposed connection with the northern rising. From Michaelmas, 1537, to the same date in the following year, the work of destruction was pushed on very vigorously. Besides the houses of friars, the dissolutions of some of which are described in the last chapter, and the monasteries of Woburn and Lenton, which in this year fell under

* Canon Dixon, in the second volume of his "History of the Church of England."

the law of attainder, many other of the larger monasteries either surrendered or in some other way came into the king's hands before the feast of St. Michael, 1538. The circumstances attending the destruction of one or two of these may be taken as a sample of the methods employed in the work.

The need of voluntary surrenders for the legal possession of the monasteries not included by parliament in the pecuniary limit assigned for suppression has already been pointed out. The instructions given to the royal agents were, by all methods known to them to get the religious "willingly to consent and agree" to their own extinction. And it was only when they found "any of the said heads and convents so appointed to be dissolved so wilful and obstinate that they would in no wise" agree to sign and seal their own death warrant that the commissioners were authorized to "take the possession of the house" and property by force.* For many months, in fact, since the first wholesale dissolution of the lesser monasteries commenced, popular rumour had spoken of the total destruction of the abbeys of England, and the seizure of their lands and wealth, as the ultimate goal to which the royal intentions aimed. The religious themselves, whilst hoping against hope that a change of the regal whims might bring back union with Rome and dismissal of the then all-powerful, and, as they regarded

* R. O. Chapter House Bk., A. 35, f. 1, *et. seq.* Quoted more in detail *ante*, pp. 226-227.

them, evil counsellors, could have had little expectation that, under existing circumstances, their lot would ultimately prove more fortunate than that of their poorer brethren. Against such a notion it was to the king's interest to protest. A belief that within a brief period, to be measured, probably, by weeks or months, their property would pass into the royal power would naturally tend to make the monks not alone careless in the supervision of buildings and lands, but anxious to save something, if possible, from the general spoliation for themselves. Hence the visitors frequently in their letters urge rapidity of action when once the resolution has been taken to deal with a particular abbey or convent. Hence, also, the care with which Henry and his agents endeavoured to dissemble any royal intention of suppressing the monastic body throughout the country.

Thus the unscrupulous doctor Layton, in a letter written in the middle of January, 1538, describes his efforts to prevent the spread of reports detrimental to the king's interests. "On my coming to Barnwell priory on the 12th day in the evening," he says, "it was immediately bruited in Cambridge that the priory should be even then suppressed,* and that I would go from thence to Ely and to Bury and suppress wheresoever I came: and that the king's highness was fully determined to suppress all monas-

* The house was surrendered on the 8th November following, to Dr. Legh (App. ii. to 8th Rept. Dep. Keeper, p. 9).

teries: and that Mr. Southwell and I were sent into Norfolk only for that purpose. Which bruit to stop, and to satisfy the people, I went with expedition to the abbeyes and priories, calling unto me all such gentlemen and honest men as were nigh inhabitants there. I (then) openly in the chapter house commanded and charged the abbots and priors with their convents in the king's behalf that they should not in any wise for fear of any such bruit or vain babbling of the people waste, destroy or spoil their woods, nor sell their plate or jewels of their church nor mortgage or pledge any part or parcels of the same for any such intent; nor let out their granges, pastures or glebe, ever retained in their hands for the maintenance of their house and hospitality, nor to make excessive fines for renewing any manor's lease for a hundred years . . . nor to sell or alienate their lands and revenues nor diminish their rents; nor sell any manor portion, pension, quit rent or any such like appertaining to their monastery. And finally (I ordered them) to keep everything in the same state as they have done always heretofore, and as they of right are bound and not to give any credit to the vain babbling of the people. And whatsoever they were that persuaded them to make any such alienation or sale, alleging that the king would suppress them and all other religious houses, and that it would be better for them to make their hands betimes than too late, no matter of what condition the people who said this were," the doctor continues,

"in this they utterly slandered the king their natural sovereign lord." He told them not to believe such reports, and "commanded the abbots and priors to set" those who related such things "in the stocks," unless they were gentlemen, when they were to acquaint Crumwell.

"This digression," Layton concludes, "hath somewhat hindered us for Westacre, which if I should not have sped before the dissolution of the same, the rumour would have so greatly increased in the heads of the common people, that surely all abbots and priors would have made foul shifts before we could have made full expedition and all finished at Westacre. Your (*i.e.*, Crumwell's) commandment therefore given me in your gallery in that behalf was much more weighty than I at that time judged or supposed or would have believed if I had not seen the very experience thereof."*

That the far-seeing minister had been fully alive to the danger is evident from the draft of a letter sent to various monasteries to assure them that no intention of suppressing existed. "Albeit," this letter of Crumwell runs, "I doubt not but, having not long since received the king's highness's letters wherein his majesty signified to you that using yourselves like his good and faithful subjects, his grace would not in any wise interrupt you in your state and kind of living; and that his pleasure therefore was that in case any man should declare anything to the

* R. O. Crum. Corr., xx., 16.

contrary you should cause him to be apprehended and kept in sure custody till further knowledge of his grace's pleasure,—you would so firmly repose yourself in the tenour of the said letters as no man's words nor any voluntary surrender made by any governor or company of any religious house since that time shall put you in any doubt or fear of suppression or change of your kind of life and policy." The king, however, feels that there are people who "upon any voluntary and frank surrender would persuade and blow abroad a general and violent suppression." And because some houses have lately been surrendered the king commands me to say "that unless there had been overtures made by the said houses that have resigned, his grace would never have received the same. And his majesty intendeth not in any wise to trouble you or to devise for the suppression of any house that standeth, except they shall either desire of themselves with one whole consent to resign and forsake the same or else misuse themselves contrary to their allegiance." In this last case, the document concludes, they shall lose "more than their houses and possessions, that is the loss also of their lives." Wherefore take care of your houses and beware of spoiling them like some have done "who imagined they were going to be dissolved."*

The king's fears that his work of spoliation might be anticipated by the monks themselves if they were

* B. Mus. Cott. MS. Cleop., E. iv., f. 86.

allowed to suspect his designs were not altogether groundless. Numerous examinations held some years later as to sales and leases of lands, gifts of annuities and pledging of plate and jewels, prove that even a suspicion of the coming destruction was enough to make the monks anticipate it. Thus, to take one or two examples of the many that might be cited, a month before the dissolution of Wormesley, a priory of Austin canons in Herefordshire, Roger Scrotty, the prior, let a tithe, for which previously the convent had got £7 a year, for only thirty shillings, "because," as he said, "the person was his friend." One of the late canons, however, confessed under examination that 400 marks had been paid by the purchaser, and that the sale was made "with a condition to surrender the said lease to the same late prior and convent again, if the said late monastery should not be dissolved." Further the lease was deposited with a third party to await the event.* In the same way it was proved that the White friars of Doncaster a few days before the dissolution of their house had leased a house and forty acres,† and so was it the case with many leases made in view of the coming spoliation.

The prior of Launde, of which Crumwell notes: "Item to remember Launde for my part thereof," affords an interesting instance of the way in which some of the coveted plate and other valuables dis-

* R. O. Augt. Off. Misc. Bk. 110, No. 73.

† *Ibid.*, Bk. 111, No. 166.

appeared. A gentleman of the county of Leicester some years after the dissolution of this priory informed the chancellor of the court of Augmentation that shortly before the suppression when he was "riding from Sowerby to Sir John Villiers he met with a cart laden at Old Thorpe. With this cart there rode a canon and three servants of the prior of Launde." He asked them what was in the cart, "because the cart horse swetted very fast." One of the servants replied, "It is some of the shortest stuff of Launde priory and so went his way smiling." Also the same informer had been told that a basket of plate had been carried from the priory to a house at Sowerby, and remained there for six weeks after the dissolution, when it was taken to the late prior at "Frisby parsonage."

Other witnesses deposed that "three geldings and a mare" belonging to the priory were brought to a neighbour's stable shortly before the suppression whence they were taken to the parsonage of Frisby, that "three suits of vestments," formerly belonging to the monastery, were saved from the sale of the effects in the same way, and that in the same place were hidden in a chest several pieces of plate—goblets, spoons and other silver articles—for a year or more after the dissolution.*

In the same way a curious story is told about some plate that belonged to the abbey of Croyland. The person examined had been one of the monks,

* *Ibid.*, Bk. 133, ff. 32-33.

and, when the exiled abbot, John Briggs, was dying shortly after, "was his confessor and one of his executors." He had heard that the late abbot had some plate given him by the king's commissioners. And "the said deponent," continues the record of the examination, "saith that he required of the said abbot on his death bed to know where his plate was, and he said that after his death it should be found in his chamber . . . in a spruce coffer by his bedside." Besides this box there was another chest "bound with iron," which contained several pieces of plate. And "this deponent saith that about eight weeks before the surrender he went by the command of the abbot to one John Mereshouse at Croyland and there opened a long chest," in which there was some of the silver plate found on the abbot's death, "and a standing piece which was after given to the earl of Essex that then was."*

So, too, John Calans, a Coventry goldsmith, bought of some of the canons of Stoneleigh a "silver censer" and other things which had been pledged previously "for £14 or thereabouts." And the prior of Sulby sold about £20 worth of silver articles to the same man, as well as his "cross staff," which he disposed of "at Coventry fair on Corpus Christi day" to the wife of Laurence Warren, a London goldsmith. About this date also a pair of silver candlesticks, "parcel gilt," were offered for sale in the same city, which were believed to come from the church at Garendon abbey.†

* *Ibid.*, f. 42.

† *Ibid.*, f. 47.

Instances such as these could be multiplied, but the above are sufficient to show that the monasteries were often not inclined to wait calmly for the coming of the spoiler. Examples of leases made conditionally upon the suppression are very frequently met with, and more than one, in which for a similar purpose a lease, made on the eve of the dissolution, was antedated. Frequently the monks were no doubt moved by the desire or need to meet the liabilities of their convent, which were in all cases great, in some positively overwhelming. In most instances, however, their intention in thus anticipating the royal seizure was probably the outcome of a natural desire to save something from the general ruin.

As to the "surrenders" themselves little need be said. About 150 monasteries of men appear to have signed away their property, and by the formal deed to have handed over all rights to the king. The act, however, can hardly with justice be called free and voluntary. With Henry's hand upon their throats it was a question between life and possessions. Even staunch resistance to the royal will would not save the property, of which they were the guardians, from the covetous designs of king and minister. Refusal to resign at their bidding meant certain loss of the pittance generally allotted to those who acquiesced in the spoliation, and possible death for such temerity. It is not given to all to offer life for honour when no real advantage is purchased by the sacrifice. However much, there-

fore, the compliance of the monks is to be regretted, it must be confessed that the heroism of refusal could hardly be looked for in many. Moreover, Henry had carefully prepared the way for his design by the removal of refractory abbots, the substitution of others more pliable, and by other methods calculated to insure success, to which reference will be made hereafter. It is well, also, to bear in mind that the idea of any general attack on monasticism was not only kept in the background, but actually repudiated by both king and agents. The monasteries stood alone. Singly they were attempted, and singly they fell.

It was in the years 1538 and 1539 that most of the "surrenders" were made. Some three or four houses only came into the king's possession in this way during the latter half of 1537. The convent of the London Carthusians is the earliest recorded at this time, but the document has no signatures appended to it, and the surrender of the Benedictine abbey of Chertsey may be regarded as the first legal document of this kind. It was signed by John Cordrey, the abbot, and fourteen of his monks, who, however, were not disbanded, but transferred to Bisham, which had been "dissolved and granted to the king by William Barlow bishop of St. David's and late commendatory prior," on the 5th of July, 1536. Here, on December 18th, 1537, the old community of Chertsey were established by royal charter, "in consideration that the said John Cordrey the

late abbot and convent granted their monastery and possessions to the king," as "king Henry's new monastery of Holy Trinity,"* with certain privileges and exemptions. The royal foundation, however, although endowed with lands to the value of nearly £700 a year, was very short lived, for on the 17th of June, 1538, or just six months after its establishment, it was again resigned into the king's hands.†

Doctor Layton, who was engaged in this work of suppression, wrote on June 22nd to Crumwell:—"We have taken the assurance for the king. The abbot a very simple man, the monks of small learning and much less discretion. Plate very little, household stuff none but the abbot's bed and one mattress for two of his servants. I caused a bed to be borrowed in the town and brought into the abbey for Dr. Carne and myself. In lieu of hangings bare walls throughout the house; cattle none, but bought this day and to-morrow to the larder, saving a few milch kine not twelve in number. In the garners not one bushel of wheat, malt or other grains. Vestments small store and not one good, for the abbot hath made money of all the best and sold them in London and even so the church plate." He then goes on to attribute this to the abbot's fondness for "white-wine, sugar and burage," and says he has been obliged to raise money out "of the rotten copes and bells" to "despatch" the monks. On the other

* Rot. Pat., 29 Hen. VIII., Pars. iv., m. 12.

† Eighth Rept. Dep. Keeper, App. ii., p. 13.

hand, this visitor gives a good account of the state of the crops growing on the land, and concludes thus:—"This day we despatched the monks for they be much desirous to be gone for yesterday when we were making sale of the old vestments within the chapter house, then the monks made a new mart in the cloister every man bringing his cowl cast upon his neck to be sold and sold them indeed."*

On the 16th November, 1537, William Petre visited and received the surrender of Lewes priory,† together with their rights over the cell of Castleacre, which resignation was confirmed at Castleacre itself before the same royal commissioner six days later.‡ The prior of the latter place had tried to propitiate Crumwell with "four marks as a token of my love" and a patent for the same amount each year, but he had been forced to send up the deeds of "foundation" and other things demanded of him, together with a fruitless prayer for "pity on me and mine."§

* Ellis, "Orig. Letters," iii., Ser. iii., p. 265. The house was endowed with lands of the late dissolved abbey of Chertsey, and with the possessions of the priories of Cardigan, Bethkelert, Ankerwyke, Little Marlow, etc. On the present letter Ellis notes:—"From its contents we must conclude that the re-endowment by Henry VIII. could only have been promised . . . the poverty of the house is little reconcileable with the increased endowment." As the foundation only lasted from December 18, 1537, to July 19, 1538, it is more than probable no revenues were received. The goods of Bisham had already been sold on the first dissolution.

† Rot. Claus., 29 Hen. VIII., Pars. i., m. 9.

‡ *Ibid.*, m. 10.

§ R. O. Crum. Corr., iv., 178. No pension was apparently granted to any monks of either place.

At Lewes, by March 24, 1538, with the lengthening days, the work of destruction had commenced. "I advertised your lordship," writes Crumwell's agent to him, "of the length and greatness of this church and how we had begun to pull the whole down to the ground and what manner and fashion they used in pulling it down. I told your lordship of a vault on the right side of the high altar, that was borne up by four great pillars having about five chapels which are compassed in with walls" 210 feet in length. "All this is down on Thursday and Friday last. Now we are plucking down a higher vault borne up by four thick pillars 14 feet from side to side (and) 45 feet in circumference. These shall down for our second work. As it goeth forward I will advise your lordship from time to time and that your lordship may know with how many men we have done this, we brought from London 17 persons, three carpenters, two smiths, two plumbers, and one that keepeth the furnace. Everyone of these attendeth to his own office. Ten of them hewed the walls about, among which there were three carpenters; these made props to underset where the others cut away, the others broke and cut the walls. These are men exercised much better than the men we find here in the country." He then requests more men and concludes: "On Tuesday they began to cast the lead and it shall be done with such diligence and saving as may be." At the close of the letter the dimensions of the church, which they were calmly engaged

on destroying, are given. It was a hundred and fifty feet long and sixty-three high.* Its walls were five feet thick and the walls of the steeple, which was ninety feet high, were ten thick. There were two-and-thirty pillars which carried the groined roof, which over the high altar rose to the height of eighty-three feet from the ground.† Such was one of the magnificent creations of architectural skill which at this time the government were occupied in destroying in almost every part of the country.

It would be impossible within the ordinary limits of a chapter, or even a volume, to present any detailed account of the surrenders and suppressions of the greater monasteries, and the consequent destruction of buildings, which many generations had been engaged in erecting to the honour of God. All that can be here attempted, or indeed is necessary, is to make choice of one or two examples in order to present a slight sketch of the general character of the great work of spoliation.

The first monastery to surrender in 1538 was the abbey of Westacre. The history of this transaction has already been referred to ‡ in speaking about the so-called "confession" of the monks of St. Andrew's, Northampton. The actual resignation of the monastery could hardly have been very freely made, since

* The church, from other dimensions given in the letter, and from recent excavations, must have been 400 feet long. The 150 feet refers to the Eastern limb only. The letter says the circumference of the church was 1,558 feet.

† Wright, 180.

‡ Vol. i., p. 349.

a month before, on December 16 (1537), Sir Roger Townsend wrote to say that, "as directed" by Crumwell's letters, he and others had repaired to the priory, "sequestered all the property" and taken inventories * of their possessions. As to the surrender itself, two documents exist, one dated on the 14th January, 1538, and the other the following day. The first is a confession of maladministration and other general self-accusations in much the same form as the Northampton document. The second is the surrender proper, and neither apparently have been enrolled upon the close roll. Even had all been regular the surrender could hardly have meant much more than the "confession," as the property of the priory was already in the hands of Crumwell's commissioners. What makes it somewhat more strange is that Layton, on the 18th of January, wrote, in a letter already quoted, so as to imply that the suppression was not an accomplished fact at that date. The work of putting a stop to the rumours of the coming suppressions had "hindered" him, he says, at "Westacre," and he adds:—"What untruth and dissimulation we find in the prior! What falsehood in false knaves amongst the convent! What bribery, spoil and ruin with crafty colours of bargains contrived by the inhabitants it were too long to write; but for a conclusion all their wrenches, wiles and guiles shall nothing prevail them, and so God willing we shall serve the king truly."† Still more

* R. O. Crum Corr., xliii., 36. † R. O. Crum. Corr., xx., 16.

curious is it to find that the doctor and his fellow commissioner Southwell wrote from Westacre on the 28th of January to say that they came to Westacre on the 16th of that month, the day after the surrender is supposed to have been signed, and that together with the voluntary recognition of the supposed offences signed by the religious they had obtained a lease of the lands for a year to Southwell "with remainder to the king for ever."*

The surrender of Abingdon on the 9th of February of this same year, 1538, presents one or two remarkable features. Like many of the monasteries, the financial state of this great abbey does not appear to have been very flourishing. There had been difficulties with tenants, implying costly lawsuits and compromises. Internally the discipline of the cloister had suffered by the interference of the king and his vicar general. Shaxton, the bishop of Salisbury, had safe in prison a monk of the house, who, when by the royal orders two of his brethren "were scraping out the bishop of Rome's name," came and told them that they "who set knife and pen to the book were cursed."† On the other hand, exactions and demands of Crumwell hampered the abbot in the administration of his house. "Your letters" demand, writes the abbot to him, that I give the office of "chamberer" to one Richard Berall, "a monk of this my monastery, by convent seal for the rest of his life. It hath not been seen in time past

* *Ibid.*, 39.

† *Ibid.*, xxxviii., 52.

that any monk hath ever had a convent seal of any office. For if he had it I think it were my duty to take it from him. Also it is against his religion and standeth not with his profession. Wherefore seeing that it standeth neither with the good custom of the house nor doth agree with the good order of religion I therefore beseech your good mastership with all my heart to be good master unto me that I may order a monk as he ought to be ordered according to the good rule of religion and that no such precedent may be had.”*

The good order of the abbey, however, mattered little to Crumwell, who enters on his notes in the year 1537, together with other similar matters to be held in memory, “Item the suppression of Abingdon.”† How this was accomplished may be judged from one circumstance. On the 7th of February, 1538, a sum of £600, more than £6,000 of our money, was paid by royal warrant to doctors Tregonwell and Petre, “to be spent by them on bringing about the dissolution of the monastery of Abingdon.”‡ The monastery surrendered two days later. Thomas Pentecost, *alias* Rowland, the abbot, obtained the grant of a pension of £200 a year and a house to live in, and

* *Ibid.*, i., 9. It is curious to note the peculiar form in which Richard Birrall signs the deed of surrender, “concedo et ego Richardus Birrall.”

† B. Mus. Cott. MS. Titus, B. i., f. 468d.

‡ R. O. Exch. Aug. Off. Mins. Accts., 28 Hen. VIII., 1 Edw. VI., 155. This sum is also entered as paid on Treasurer’s Roll, I., m. 12d.

each of the monks a suitable sum for their lives. On February the 22nd Richard Ryche wrote his report of the royal prize. The buildings he found in a great state of decay. The abbot's house was unfit for habitation, and would require a large amount of money to make it fit for the king. The ground is not fit to make a park, for if the fields on the south side of the Thames are taken for the purpose the writer believes that the town of Abingdon, which is very populous, "will decay." He concludes by asking "what part of the church, cloister, dorter, chapter house and frater shall be defaced. I think," he adds, "a great part thereof may be defaced and sufficient left to the king's contentation."*

The spoils were gathered into the royal treasure-house. Two mitres were purchased by Sir Thomas Pope, the treasurer of the Court of Augmentations, and three pontifical rings with precious stones with a silver gilt cross were saved from the melting-pot for the royal use. In the latter set in a piece of gold was a portion of the holy cross called "an esse."†

The dissolution of the abbey of Vale Royal affords an interesting insight into the methods employed to force compliance and a criterion by which to estimate the value of the surrenders. Here, as elsewhere, the demands upon the resources of the abbey had been met until it became impossible to keep up the house with any further exactions. "My lord,"

* R. O. Crum. Corr., xxxvi., 41.

† Aug. Off. Treas. Roll, I., m. 3.

writes the abbot to Crumwell on a further demand, "I most humbly beseech your good lordship, for the love of God and our Blessed Lady and for the maintenance of good service and poor hospitality to be kept in the house, to pardon our refusal."

On the 22nd of August, 1538, one of the most energetic of the king's commissioners, Thomas Leigh, was at the abbey, and on the 7th of September a surrender is said to have been made by the abbot and convent. As a valid document it was entered on the Close Roll, but it was repudiated by the abbot. At Lichfield, on his way to London, he wrote his protest against the surrender which Holcroft, the subsequent grantee,* was evidently the chief agent in extorting if not in forging. The commissioners, so said the abbot, John Harwood, had brought the royal demand that they should "clearly of our own consents surrender . . . our monastery." "My good lord," he writes to Crumwell, "the truth is, I nor my said brethren have never consented to surrender our monastery, nor yet do, nor never will do by our good wills unless it shall please the king's grace to give us commandment so to do, which I cannot perceive in the commission of master Holcroft. And if any information be given unto his majesty or your lordship, that we should consent to surrender as is above said, I assure your good lordship upon my fidelity and

* He paid £450 10s. 6d., with an annual fee of £3 5s. 8d., for the property.

truth, there was never any such consent made by me or my brethren and no person or persons had authority so to do in our names." He adds a prayer that the king may spare the monastery, and forwards "a bill indented made by me and my brethren" which the commissioner had refused.*

Harwood's journey failed in its purpose. The king could neither force the unwilling monks to surrender nor, at this date, was he apparently desirous of seizing the property without some pretence of justice. Mr. Ormerod remarks that the difficulty was overcome in this instance by bringing a capital indictment against the abbot. "The jurisdiction of the abbey courts," he writes, afforded an easy opportunity of gratifying their wishes, and lord Crumwell, the seneschal of the abbey, presided in person at a court held at Vale Royal on the Monday after the feast of the Annunciation, 1539, in which fourteen jurors found a bill against the late abbot and others for the following offences:—

"That John Harwood, late abbot of the monastery of O. B. Lady of Vale Royal consented to the slaying of Hugh Chaliner, his monk; and that, the day before the said monk's throat was cut, the said monk said unto a child, being his brother's son of twelve years of age or thereabouts, that he the said monk would be with his brother at Chester before the Assumption, or else he should suffer death if he tarried any longer in the said monastery."

The jury further found that the abbot threatened a tenant of his that he would have nothing more to do with him if he fought against the northern men in the general rising. Also that the abbot's brother approved of the northern men, and one of his vicars refused to marry a couple upon a license obtained from the king as supreme head.*

A true bill being found against the abbot on these charges his life was in grievous peril. In fact, the Cheshire tradition is said to be that he was executed.† This, however, was not the case, as in the year 1542 "John Harwood late abbot of Vale Royal" was in receipt of a pension,‡ which he continued to receive till the first year of Edward VI.§. The effect of the condemnation was doubtless sufficient to place the abbot in the royal power, and thus to overcome the opposition to surrender of which John Harwood had given such unmistakable proofs.

The pressure put upon the monks to resign their property may be illustrated by two letters relating to houses in the county of Somerset—the one from the prior of the Charterhouse of Hinton, the other from a priest employed to endeavour to bring about the surrender of Athelney Abbey. "In

* Ormerod's "Cheshire," i., 503. Also see "Monasticon," v., 701, *note*. The document is said to be a transcript of the Original Inquisition, and addressed "to Thomas Holcroft be these directed with speed." For the Inquisition, see R. O. State Papers, Dom., 1539, $\frac{v}{31}$.

† *Ibid.*

‡ R. O. Aug. Off. Misc. Bk., 248, 41.

§ R. O. Aug. Off. Treasurer's Roll, III., m. 106.

the Lord Jesus shall be your salutation," writes prior Horde to his brother Alan, a barrister of the Middle Temple. "And where ye marvel that I and my brethren do not freely and voluntarily give and surrender up our house at the motion of the king's commissioners, but stand stiffly, and as you think obstinately, in our opinion; truly, brother, I marvel greatly that you think so, but rather that you would have thought us light and hasty in giving up that thing which is not ours to give, but dedicate to Almighty God for service to be done to His honour continually, with other many good deeds of charity which daily be done in this house to our Christian neighbours. And considering that there is no cause given by us why the house shall be put down, but that the service of God, religious conversation of the brethren, hospitality, alms-deeds, with all other our duties, be as well observed in this poor house as in any religious house in this realm or in France; which we have trusted that the king's grace would consider. But because that ye write of the king's high displeasure and my lord privy seal's, who ever hath been my especial good lord and I trust yet will be, I will endeavour myself, as much as I may, to persuade my brethren to a conformity in this matter; so that the king's highness nor my said good lord shall have any cause to be displeased with us, trusting that my poor brethren who know not where to have their living, shall be charitably looked upon."*

* Ellis, "Orig. Letters," ii., Ser. ii., p. 99.

After dissolving the abbey of Keynsham, John Tregonwell and William Petre, the two royal commissioners, arrived at Hinton on January 25th, 1539, for the same purpose. "Immediately after our coming," they write to Crumwell, "we entered conversation with the prior there about the cause of our coming and used such means and persuasions unto him for the purpose as we thought most meet and might best take place in him. His answer in effect was, that if the king's majesty would take his house, so (that) it proceeded not of his voluntary surrender he was contented to obey; but otherwise he said his conscience would not suffer him willingly to give over the same. In the end after long conversation he desired delay to make us answer until this morning. At this time, we often using like diligence in persuading him as we did before, he declared himself to be of the same mind he was 'yester-night,' or rather more stiff in the same. In conversation with the convent we perceived them to be of the same mind the prior was and had much like answer of them as we had from the prior (three only excepted who were conformable). And amongst the rest one Nicholas Balland, monk there, being incidentally examined of the king's highness' title of supremacy, expressly denied the same, affirming the bishop of Rome to be the vicar of Christ and that he is and ought to be taken for supreme head of the Church."*

* R. O. Crum. Corr., xliii., 74. In a letter written on the 24th June, Sir W Hungerford says he has "kept in his house till I know

Crumwell had long had his eye upon this house. Lord Stourton had written to him about a vision the prior was said to have had which appeared to forecast the execution of one of Henry's queens,* and he had entered on his "remembrances" "of the Charterhouse at Hinton."† And so, by March 31st, 1539, the opposition to the king's demands was broken down, and the surrender signed by prior Horde and fourteen monks. Two others, one of whom was Nicholas Balland, did not apparently sign the document.‡ The house was sold by Tregonwell to Sir Walter Hungerford, but although he paid his money he complains three months later that Sir Thomas Arundel had on a royal grant sold and "despoiled and quite carried away a great part of the church and other superfluous buildings next."§

In much the same way the surrender of the abbey of Athelney was evidently procured by pressure. On November 2nd, 1538, the parson of Holford writes an account of his visit to the abbot at the instigation of Crumwell and chancellor Audley. "I found," he says, "the said abbot in the church coming from your pleasure" this Nicholas Balland, who publicly declared he would die for the belief that the pope was the only head of the Church (*Ibid.*, xviii., 11).

* *Ibid.*, xl., 71.

† Calendar, ix., No. 498.

‡ Eighth Rept. Dep. Keeper, App. ii., p. 23.

§ R. O. Crum. Corr., xviii., 11. On April 4th, 1540, grants of pensions were made to the prior and 22 monks, including Nicholas Balland (R. O. Augt. Off. Misc. Bk., 233, f. 242). For payment see A. O. Mins. Acct. 30-31 Hen. VIII., 224 m. 8d.

mass at the hour of ten o'clock before noon. And, as reverently as I could, I delivered the said my lord and master's letters and showed him that my lord Audeley recommended him to him. And the said abbot answered: 'I am glad to hear of my lord's welfare.' And so he read his letter and said: 'Go with me to my chamber and you shall know my mind.' And I followed the said abbot and suddenly he stopped and said: 'What, is my lord Audeley a man of the new set or after the old sort?' 'My lord,' said I, 'he is after the best sort and like a kind heart subject to the king's grace and a good Englishman that loveth all the realm.' 'Well,' said the abbot, 'do you think he doth not judge there will be another world shortly?' 'My lord,' said I, 'there will be another world when we be out of this world, but in this I think there was never so gracious a prince as the king's grace is, for he loveth virtue and will punish vice.' Wherewith the said abbot shook his head and said: 'Hear you no new tidings of this great council beyond the sea?' 'No, my lord,' said I, 'there is no matter to be passed upon in their council, for the king will provide surely for all such matters.' And therewith I was in a study, for I wist not what that matter meant. And the abbot said again: 'Well, if I wist what would come of these matters I would soon be at a point with my lord.' With that the abbot went forth and said: 'I will write a letter to my lord and ye shall learn my mind.' And then he went to his chamber where he

called me in secret to him and said : ' Is it not my lord's mind to have me resign my house to him ? ' ' No my lord,' said I, ' but it may fortune upon good considerations and causes, that he would have you resign your house into the king's hands.' And then said he : ' Our house would be destroyed and all the country undone by that means as it is about Muchelney.' ' No, my lord,' said I ; ' my lord master will come and dwell here and I think he will be a petitioner to the king's highness to have some part of the order here, as it is at Saint Mary's Altar ' (?). This I said, somewhat to satisfy the abbot's mind. ' Why,' said he, ' then what should I have ? ' ' My lord,' said I, ' I dare undertake if you will be advised by my lord, he will get you a hundred marks and he will get you some prebend of the bishop of Sarum, whereby ye shall wear a grey almuce, and all your brothers shall be provided for and shall have services and promotions as shall be meet for them.' ' Well,' said the abbot and shook up his hand, ' if I would have taken a hundred marks I could have been stayed ere this time, but I will fast three days on bread and water than take so little.' ' My lord,' said I, ' I speak of the least. You will find my lord much better when you speak with him.' ' Well,' said he again, ' if I wist what should come of it, I would soon be at a point.' And therewith he sat himself down and eat bread and butter and made me eat with him." The writer then tells how the abbot wrote his letter to the chancellor, and how going to

see the steward, he spoke with the community, and found them willing to take Audley's advice, and resign their house at the king's bidding.*

Athelney had long been burdened with debt. Under Crumwell's direction the house had bound itself to pay the king 200 marks. "By frequent changes of abbots," as Robert Hamlin, the last abbot, declared, "the king had had of the poor house many sums of money," and he had little hope to pay his debts in less than seven years, though he "eat bread and water two days a week."†

The abbey was surrendered to the king on February 8th, 1539, by the abbot and six brethren, who all received pensions for their compliance with the royal will.‡ The effects of the monastery were sold for £80, of which sum Audley, who showed such anxiety to obtain the abbot's resignation, paid £20 for the buildings.§

The action of Audley was not confined to Athelney. He says himself that he sent for the abbot of Osyth's "before the dissolution and induced him to yield the house to the king's majesty's good will, and that he should exhort his convent to conform themselves to the same, who by my advice

* B. Mus. Cott. MS. Cleop., E. iv., f. 135.

† R. O. Crum. Corr., ii., 3. In another letter he expresses his wish to find some one to lend him £500 without interest, and be content to get it back £100 every year. His debts are, he says, £889 12s. 7d., and his yearly charges £34 2s. 7d. (Harl. MS., 604, f. 69).

‡ R. O. Aug. Off. Misc. Bk., 233, f. 105.

§ R. O. Aug. Off. Mins. Accts., 30-31 Hen. VIII., 224, m. 6d.

and exhortation conformed themselves as humble subjects without murmur or grudge, wherein I trust that I have not for my part served the king's highness amiss." He then goes on to ask Crumwell to obtain him some return, for "I have no fee nor office of his highness," he says, "but the chancellorship and although it be high and honourable yet it is cumberous and chargeable."*

In the same way, even Burnet allows that the king prepared the way for the suppression by skilfully selecting men who were likely to resign their houses when called upon. Thus John Capon, or Salcot, abbot of Hyde, although made bishop of Bangor in 1534, was allowed to remain commendatory of his monastery, and upon surrendering it in 1539 into the king's hands was rewarded with the See of Salisbury. So, too, Robert Pursglove, the prior of Gisburne, who was bishop of Hull, as a suffragan of York, not only surrendered himself, but was active in persuading others to act in the same way. He obtained a pension of £200 a year.† Stephen

* Wright, 239.

† The royal visitors had compelled the predecessor of Pursglove to resign his office in February, 1537, and had appointed "a friend" of Crumwell. Pursglove was sent to Whitby in October, 1538, to be present at an election of the abbot. He tried to force the community to let him "nominate" the one desired by Crumwell. This they refused. He then endeavoured to get them to allow his master to have the election; they again refused, and claimed the right of free election. This the royal agents would not allow. The prior started for London to lodge a complaint (Wright, 249). The whole letter shows clearly how the elections were managed, in the

Sagar, abbot of Hayles, having been sent for to London, made a "privy surrender,"* and was despatched to his convent to obtain the general consent. This he managed so well that he obtained high praise from the commissioners, who said he "did surrender his house with such discreet and frank manner, as we have seen no other do better in all our journey."†

"What could not be effected by arguments and fair promises," writes the learned Dugdale, "was by *terror* and severe dealing brought to pass. For under pretence of dilapidation in the buildings or negligent administration of their offices as also for breaking the king's injunctions they deprived some abbots and then put others that were more pliant in their room." Thus Richard Boreman, *alias* Stevenage, the abbot of St. Alban's, was placed in the room of abbot Catton in April, 1538.‡ On the last years of the existence of the monasteries, and many other instances could be given of the strenuous efforts made by the crown to secure superiors pliant to the royal will. Whitby was dissolved on December 14th, 1539; no legal surrender was apparently made, but the monks were pensioned, Henry Darell, the abbot, receiving 100 marks (R. O. Aug. Off. Misc. Bk., 246, f. 14). For some time efforts had been made to force the late abbot of Whitby, John Hexham, to resign. He had refused, and although reports had been spread that he was willing, he wrote denying them. In the end he gave up his office to W. Petre in August, 1538 (Crum. Corr. xxxiii., 62).

* R. O. Crum. Corr., xx., 15.

† Wright, 237.

‡ The *congé* on the "deprivation" of Catton is dated 23 Jan., 1538. Rot. Pat., 29 Hen. VIII., Pars. iii., m. 9.

10th of December of the previous year two royal commissioners, Legh and Petre, had written about Saint Alban's that "by confession of the abbot himself," there appears to be "just cause of deprivation, not only for breaking the king's injunctions, but also for manifest dilapidation, making of shifts, negligent administration and sundry other causes, yet, by what means we know not, in all communications or motions made concerning any surrender he showeth himself so stiff, that, as he saith, he will choose to beg his bread all the days of his life than consent to surrender." The visitors tried every means to change him, but, as they say, "he waxeth hourly more obstinate and less conformable." They ask for instructions. If they depose him the house is in such debt "that no man will take the office of abbot here upon him, except any do it for that purpose to surrender the same to the king's hands; and by this means" they think "this may most easily and with least speech be brought to the king's highness' purpose." Another method they suggest is to leave the unfortunate abbot for a time in suspense "in utter despair of any favour," and perhaps he will then, expecting "to be deprived," "sue to have his surrender taken, because he would be assured of some living."*

But abbot Catton kept his word. Neither pressure from without nor the burden of difficulties could move him to do the king's will by surrender or resignation.

* Wright. 250.

Deprivation soon followed this letter. The last free abbot of St. Alban's had no pension.

Richard Boreman, who succeeded, had his difficulties. He failed to pay his "first-fruits" to the king, and got locked up. "Mr. Gostwick," he writes to Crumwell, "hath detained me from my liberty and keepeth me within his gates so that I can have no friendly means of him for my liberty. Notwithstanding I have offered him to pay out of hand £300, which is as much as I have and can make friends for in this short time, he demandeth of me besides other great sums the first payment of the first-fruits, which is above all my power to do. . . . Now this evening, I am like to be imprisoned in the compter to my bitter shame and undoing."*

On December 5th, 1539, abbot Richard, who, as the commissioners suggested, had doubtless taken the office for the purpose, surrendered the abbey into the king's hands. Not more than half a century before abbot William of Wallingford, had built the rich and sumptuous high altar at a cost of above £733, and had beautified the church with gifts worth, as Weaver calculated, more than £8,000. This noble minster was redeemed from destruction and sacrilege by the townspeople, who purchased it from the king for £400. On the 17th December the sacred vessels and the treasures of St. Alban's shrine were brought into the royal jewel house, and formed a rich prize of no less

* R. O. Crum. Corr., i., 50.

than 122 ounces of gold, 2,990 ounces of gilt plate, and 1,144 ounces of parcel gilt and silver. Golden buckles, in which were set "great agates, cameos and coarse pearles," three pontifical mitres, and 400 ounces of copper, formed part of the plunder.*

In the same way Clement Litchfield was compelled to resign the abbey of Evesham to one who would surrender it to the king. The royal inquisitors had reported this abbot to be "chaste in his living, and to right well overlook the reparations of his house." He it was who built the noble gateway, which still remains a memorial of him, and, although he had been obliged to pay £160 for his temporalities, with large sums as loans to the king and Wolsey, and for a whole year to keep four-and-twenty royal lacqueys and their horses, he still managed to adorn the choir and to add two chantries to the churches of St. Lawrence and All Saints.† To Latimer, the bishop of Worcester, he was, in the vigorous language employed by that ecclesiastic, a

* *Monastic Treasures*, Abbotsford Club, p. 29. Among these jewels was doubtless the "lapide preciosum qui constat ex sardonice, calcedonio et onic," presented to the church by king Ethelred II. Mathew Paris (*Additamenta* ed. Luard vi., p. 387) describes how the king "coming one day to Saint Albans entered the chapter house, brought with him the said stone and kindly and lovingly offered it to the church, praising it and pointing out its merits. He asked," says the historian, "that the abbot and convent should lay a sentence of excommunication against all who should at any time take away this his gift." (See too the facsimiles in that volume.)

† May's "Evesham," p. 72.

"bloody abbot," which probably means that he did not agree with him in his reforming tendencies.

On the 17th of March, 1538, William Petre, the royal commissioner, wrote to Crumwell:—"According to your commandment I have been at Evesham and there received the resignation of the abbot, which he was contented to make immediately upon the sight of your lordship's letters, saving that he desired me very instantly that I would not open the same during the time of my being here, because (as he said) it would be noted that he was compelled to resign for fear of deprivation."* On the 4th of April Philip Harford succeeded,† whom Latimer had assured Crumwell he would find "a true friend."‡ On January 27, 1540, the monastery was surrendered, the young abbot getting a pension of £240 a year as his reward.§

Another example of the personal pressure exerted by the king's agents to induce the religious to surrender may be here given. The important convent of Romsey, in Hampshire, on the eve of its dissolution maintained a community of twenty-five nuns, ruled over by an abbess, Elizabeth Ryprose. They appear to have been unwilling to fall in with the royal views or to abandon the religious life in order that their property might pass into Henry's possession. Eight

* Wright, 177. † Rot. Pat., 29 Hen. VIII., m. 14.

‡ R. O. Crum. Corr., xlix., 42.

§ R. O. Augt. Office Misc. Bk., 245, f. 105. There is no deed of surrender and no enrolment on the Close Roll.

nuns, nearly a third of the entire community, had made their religious profession on July 28th, 1534, only a few years before their troubles commenced.* One of these was Catherine, youngest daughter of Sir Nicholas Wadham, governor of the Isle of Wight, whose sister Jane had been for some years a professed nun in the same abbey of Romsey. At this time the convent steward was a certain John Foster, who lived at Baddesley, near Romsey, and rented the greater tithes of that place from the Hospitallers of St. John of Jerusalem.† Foster's position would have given him accurate information as to the extent and value of the property, and his intercourse would have afforded him the means of bringing influence to bear upon the nuns. He was apparently selected by the king's agents for this delicate service, and sounded the nuns as to their dispositions to satisfy Henry's desire for their property. In the report he forwarded to Sir Thomas Seymour,‡ "of the king's Privy Chamber," he says:—"According to your request I herein signify and subscribe unto you the state of the house of Romsey. . . . First you shall understand that the house is out of debt; also the plate and jewels are worth £300 and more; six bells are worth £100 at least; also the church is a great

* For this and much other valuable information I am indebted to F. J. Baigent, Esq., of Winchester. His cordial co-operation and encouragement in my work I desire here gratefully to acknowledge.

† Mr. Baigent's MSS. Collections.

‡ Brother of Jane Seymour, one of Henry's wives.

sumptuous thing, all of free stone and covered with lead, which, as I esteem it, is worth £300 or £400 or rather much better."* Foster then goes on to give particulars of the rents coming from the abbey lands, on some at least of which Seymour had set his heart.† He then concludes:—"And where you wrote unto me by Mr. Fleming, that I should ascertain you whether I thought the abbess with the rest of the nuns would be content to surrender up their house: the truth is I do perceive throughout the motion that your kinswomen and other (of) your friends made for you, (that) they will be content at all times to do you any pleasure they may. But I perceive they would be loath to trust to the commissioners' gentleness, for they hear say that other houses have been straightly handled."‡

Attached to this letter is a list of the nuns in the abbey. From this it appears that Catherine Wadham, who had only been four or five years in the convent, had mounted up to the office of subprioress, while her sister held the next rank. These, and another, Elizabeth Hill, were the kinswomen of Sir Thomas Seymour, through whose influence John Foster hoped to accomplish the voluntary destruction of the convent.§ Apparently his design was unsuccessful.

* This building was afterwards purchased of the king by the inhabitants for some £400.

† 10th Report Deputy Keeper, p. 268. "Particulars for Grants."

‡ B. Mus. Royal MS., 7, C., xvi., f. 147.

§ Sir Nicholas Wadham, the father of the two nuns of that name, married twice. His first wife was daughter of Robert Hill, of

cessful. There is no surrender deed of the abbey; neither are the names of the abbess and her nuns found in the pension lists.

If there were some who were urgent with the monks to do all that Henry wished and surrender their houses and goods into his hands, there were not wanting others who exhorted them to remain staunch to their religious vocation. Above others Dr. Richard Hillyard, the late secretary to bishop Tunstal, of Durham, endeavoured to instil the spirit of heroic resistance into the souls of the religious. He escaped from Henry's hands into Scotland, or he would certainly have paid for his boldness with his life. As it was he was attainted and condemned to death in his absence.* The doctor "says in Edinburgh," writes an informer, "that he fled away because he had given counsel to sundry religious houses, yet unsuppressed, not to render their houses into the king's hands until they were violently put therefrom." Another informed Sir William Eure, as Antony, and his second Margaret, daughter of Sir John Seymour, of Wolfhall, Wilts, and sister to queen Jane Seymour and Sir Thomas Seymour. The high connection of the Wadhams seems to suggest a reason for the early promotion of Catherine to a high office in her convent. Of John Foster, of Baddesley, the writer of the above letter, one who lived at the end of the 16th century records a rhyme popular in the neighbourhood when he went to school as a boy:—

"Mr. Foster of Baddesley was a good man
Before the marriage of priests began,
For he was the first that married a nun,
For which he begat a very rude son."

—(Mr. Baigent's MSS. Collections).

* Rot. Parl., Hen. VIII., 147.

he writes, " that the said Hillyard saith himself that he being in company with certain gentlemen would lament the suppression of the house of Mountgrace and spake large words in favour of the same house. Unto which, as the same Hillyard affirmeth, a gentleman answered: ' that for as small offences as the said Hillyard did commit by speaking these words at that time he had seen men taken as traitors to the king's majesty.' And so the same Hillyard fearing to have been accused for the said words did so suddenly convey himself out of the realm."*

The only religious mentioned by name as connected with Hillyard was the prior of Mountgrace. He was supposed to have helped him to escape, and Eure gave information to Crumwell, in order that " further search, as well touching the prior as his ' conversants and familiars,' might be made."† John Wilson, the prior of Mountgrace, was examined, and confessed having talked to Dr. Hillyard about the suppressions. He had been convinced of the

* B. Mus. Cott. MS. Calig., B. vii., f. 249. The story of the escape of Hillyard through the help of the prioress of Coldstream is full of interest, but foreign to the present subject. Henry demanded that Hillyard should be given up to him by the Scotch king as one who " had laboured to sow in the realm much sedition." The envoy was to bring him back at once if possible, " having special watch for the sure conveyance of him, and specially noting in his return who shall be desirous to talk with him " (Sadler Papers, i., p. 12). As to Hillyard's history of his own times, see Vol. i., p. 295. The later editions of Sanders' " Schism " (e.g. 1590, p. 167) also give a quotation from his account of the destruction of the monasteries.

† *Ibid.*, f. 255.

illegality of the papal supremacy by the arguments of the bishop of Durham and archbishop Lee, but had great difficulty to persuade his brethren of this. He acknowledged that he did not wish to surrender his house "if it might have stood with the king's pleasure that he might have kept it." And "finally there never was anyone that gave unto them contrary counsel but doctor Hillyard, who said it was in a manner selling the house to surrender up their house for money or pensions."*

Another witness, Nicholas Wilson, a "prisoner in the Tower," being examined as to his relations with the escaped doctor Hillyard, wrote: "First I had a conversation with him touching the putting down of monasteries, which, as I remember now, began by my asking him to give the prior of Mountgrace, in the north, one of my friends, advice to be obedient and conform himself to the king's highness in giving up his monastery when he should be required. . . . Upon this motion the said doctor began to doubt, touching the suppression of monasteries, how it might be done. Whereunto I answered him, that their deed, who were then in the houses and had government of them, by their common consent and seal, must needs be of value in the law. And that all such things must be under the disposition and government of the king's highness and his realm as should be thought most meet for the commonwealth. Which words of mine and such other, as far as I

* R. O. State Papers, Box $\frac{v}{17}$.

perceived, did not fully then satisfy him." In this matter, continues the declaration, I have certainly tried to satisfy my own conscience and also to take away other men's scruples in obeying the act of suppression. I have told them that the king and his council did this for the common good, "although I and other mean men did not perceive the whole considerations for it, and that it was matter for subjects to be under lowly obedience and think the best of their rulers in all things. And, further, that as monasteries were founded and endowed" by the license of princes, so they ought to be able to put them to other uses if they thought it good for the state.*

* R. O. Crum. *Corr.*, xlix., 1. Mountgrace fell into the king's hands on Dec. 18, 1539. John Wilson was the prior who surrendered it (*Rot. Claus.*, 31 Hen. VIII., Pars. iv., m. 3). He obtained a pension of £60 and the house and chapel called "le Mounte." Sixteen priests, four novices and six lay brethren were also pensioned (*R. O. Aug. Off. Misc. Bk.*, 246, f. 13). In a list of those executed in this reign (*B. Mus. Add. MS.*, 27,402, f. 47) occurs the name of "—Wilson, monk of the Charterhouse Mountgrace." This could not have been the prior, and it hardly appears likely that it could have been his namesake, Nicholas Wilson, who, although "a prisoner in the Tower," was not a monk of Mountgrace. Dr. Nicholas Wilson was a Yorkshire man, and educated at Cambridge. He refused to take the oath of succession, and was sent to the Tower with Sir Thomas More. He finally took the oath, and died June 8, 1548. Hall (838) says that he and bishop Sampson, with Richard Farmer, a London grocer, were implicated "in relieving of certain traitorous persons which denied the king's supremacy." Richard Hilles (*Ep. Tigurinæ*, p. 140; *Orig. Letters*, No. 105) says: "The treason they had committed, as I hear, was sending alms to that papist Abel, then brought down to the lowest misery

It has been possible in this chapter only to take notice of some few important points in the general dissolution. The methods employed by the agents of the king in suppressing the houses of religion may be best illustrated by the account given of the destruction of Roche abbey by one who was a boy living in the neighbourhood at the time. "In the plucking down of these houses," he writes, "for the most part, this order was taken: that the visitors should come suddenly upon every house unawares (for they never looked to be visited out of doors, seeing they had pleased the king so well with their ready money bestowed upon him, in the good hope of the standing thereof) to the end to take them 'napping,' as the proverb is, lest if they should have had so much as an inkling of their coming they would have made conveyance of some portion of their own goods to help themselves withal, when they were turned forth of their houses. And, both reason and nature might well have moved them so to have done, although it may be said all was given to the king before by act of parliament, and so they had neither goods nor houses nor possessions.* And, thus they had to give the king great thanks—yea pray for him upon their black beads—that was so through his long detention in a most filthy prison, and, as the papists say, almost eaten up by worms, *vermibus fere necatus.*"—*Vide Lewis Sander's "Schism,"* pp. 145-6, *notes.*

* It is not, of course, accurate to say that parliament had given all houses and goods to the king. It can hardly be expected, however, that the writer should know the niceties of the changing law.

gracious a prince to them, to suffer them to stay so long after all was given from them. And therefore, if the visitors, being the king's officers and commissioners in that behalf, took their dinner with them and then turned them forth to seek their lodging, where they could get it (at night or at the furthest the next day in the morning) as was done indeed, they did no wrong nor truly no great right.

"For so soon as the visitors were entered within the gates they called the abbot and other officers of the house and caused them to deliver all the keys and took an inventory of all their goods, both within doors and without. For all such beasts, horses, sheep and such cattle as were abroad in pasture or grange places, the visitors caused to be brought into their presence. And when they had done so, (they) turned the abbot and all his convent and household forth of the doors.

"This thing was not a little grief to the convent and all the servants of the house, departing one from another and especially such as with their conscience could not break their profession. It would have made a heart of flint melt and weep to have seen the breaking up of the house, the sorrowful departing (of the brethren) and the sudden spoil that fell the same day of their departure from their home. And, everyone had everything good, cheap, except the poor monks, friars and nuns who had no money to bestow on anything. This appeared at the suppression of an abbey, hard by me, called Roche

abbey*—a house of White monks, a very fair built house, all of freestone and every house vaulted with freestone and covered with lead (as the abbeys were in England as the churches are (now)). At the breaking up of this an uncle of mine was present, being well acquainted with certain of the monks there. And, when they were put out of the house, one of the monks, his friend, told him that everyone of the convent had given to him his cell in which he lived, wherein was not anything of price, but his bed and apparel, which was but simple and of small price. This monk wished my uncle to buy something of him, who said, 'I see nothing which is worth money for my use.' 'No,' said he, 'give me two shillings for my cell door, which was never made with five shillings.' 'No,' said my uncle, 'I know not what to do with it' (for he was a young man unmarried, and then neither stood in need of houses or doors). But such persons as afterwards bought their corn or hay or such like, finding all the doors either open or the locks and 'shackles' plucked down, or the door itself taken away, went in and took what they found and filched it away.

"Some took the service books that lay in the

* The Cistercian abbey of Roche was surrendered on June 23rd, 1538, by the abbot and seventeen monks (Eighth Rept. Dep. Keeper, App. ii., p. 39). The deed has not been entered on the Close Roll. Henry Crundall, the abbot, was granted a pension of 50 marks, and most of the monks £5 a year (Auct. Off. Misc. Bk., 232, f. 59). A short inventory of the goods found on the dissolution at the priory is given in the "Monasticon," v., p. 506.

church and put them upon their wain 'coppes' to piece them; some took windows of the hay-loft and hid them in their hay, and likewise they did of many other things. Some pulled forth the iron hooks out of the walls that bought none, when the yeomen or gentlemen of the county had bought the timber of the church. The church was the first thing that was put to spoil and then the abbot's lodging, dorter and frater with the cloister and all the buildings thereabout within the abbey walls. Nothing was spared but the ox-houses and swine-cots and such other houses of office that stood without the walls, which had more favour shown them than the very church itself, which was done by the advice of Crumwell, as Fox reporteth in his book of Acts. It would have pitied any heart to see what tearing up of the lead there was, what plucking up of boards and throwing down of spires. And when the lead was torn off and cast down into the church and the tombs in the church all broken (for in most abbeys were divers noble men and women—yea, in some abbeys kings whose tombs were regarded no more than the tombs of inferior persons—for to what end should they stand when the church over them was not spared for their sakes) all things of price, either spoiled, carried away or defaced to the uttermost.

“The persons who cast the lead into foddors plucked up all the seats in the choir, wherein the monks sat when they said service, which were like to the seats in minsters, and burned them and melted the lead

therewith, although there was wood plenty within a flight shot of them, for the abbey stood among woods and rocks of stone. In these rocks were found pewter vessels that were conveyed away and there hidden, so that it seemeth that every person bent himself to filch and spoil what he could. Yea, even such persons were content to spoil them, that seemed not two days before to allow their religion and do great worship and reverence at their matins, masses and other services and all other of their doings. This is a strange thing to consider that they who could this day think it to be the house of God, the next (did hold it as) the house of the devil; or else they would not have been so ready to have spoiled it. . . .

“For a better proof of this, I demanded, thirty years after the suppression, of my father who had bought part of the timber of the church, and all the timber of the steeple with the bell frame, with others partners therein—(in the steeple hung eight—yea nine—bells, whereof the least but one could not be bought at this day for £20, and which bells I myself did see hang there more than a year after the suppression)—whether he thought well of the religious persons and of the religion then used. And he told me ‘Yea, for,’ said he, ‘I saw no cause to the contrary.’ ‘Well,’ said I, ‘then how came it to pass you were so ready to destroy and spoil what you thought so well of?’ ‘Might I not as well as others have some profit from the spoil of the abbey?’ said

he. 'For I saw all would away and therefore I did as others did.' . . .

"No doubt there have been millions and millions that have repented the thing since, but all too late. And thus much, upon my knowledge, touching the fall of Roche abbey which had stood about 300 years, for the church was dedicated by one Ada, bishop of Coventry (A.D. 1244). By the fall of this it may be well known how all the rest were used."*

It is, of course, somewhat difficult to estimate the number of monasteries and religious that were affected by the final suppression. Judged by the lists of surrenders, the grants of pensions and other sources of information, the abbeys and priories, exclusive of convents of women and friaries, which have already been spoken of in previous chapters, which were swept away between the years 1538 and 1540, numbered some two hundred and two. From the same information, it would appear that there were living in these houses at the date of suppression about 3,221 monks and regular canons. If to these be added 1,560, the estimated number of nuns, 1,800 that of the friars, and of religious turned out of their homes under the first act dissolving the lesser houses, excluding the nuns, some 1,500, it

* B. Mus. Add. MS., 5,813 (Cole xii.). It is said by Cole to be a copy of an old MS. written about the year 1591 which he had from Thomas Porter, of Nottinghamshire and Cambridge. Ellis, "Orig. Letters," iii., Series iii., pp. 31-36, has printed the more interesting portions. The editor remarks that the "extracts probably exhibit what was at that time the genuine as well as general feeling of the English public." The document will be again referred to in the concluding chapter of this volume.

will be seen that as a rough estimate there were in the monasteries some 6,521 monks, regular canons and friars, and some 1,560 nuns of various orders at the date of the suppression. In round numbers eight thousand religious persons were expelled from their homes at this time besides probably more than ten times that number of people who were their dependents or otherwise obtained the livings in their service.*

It would be easy to multiply the incidents, often so significant and touching, which occur in the correspondence of the time in regard to the suppression of this or that great house, the name of which still is held in honour by Englishmen; to relate how prior Goldstone of Christchurch, Canterbury, pleaded to be left to die in his old rooms; how the ruin of St. Edmundsbury broke the heart of abbot Melford; how abbot Malvern, of St. Peter's, Gloucester, unable to avert the doom of his house, could never be brought to sign the fatal surrender. Who shall tell the sorrow that filled the hearts of thousands

* The number of monasteries suppressed or surrendered between 1538 and 1540 is thus obtained:—

Benedictine	... 54 houses and	1,300 monks.
Cluniac	... 8 houses and	108 monks.
Cistercian	... 40 (including attained houses) and	596 monks.
Carthusian	... 9 houses and	134 monks.
Austin Canons	... 59 houses and	773 canons.
Premonstratensian	12 houses and	159 canons.
Gilbertine	... 20 houses and	151 religious.
Houses	202	Monks and Canons 3,221
Friars according to estimate	1,800
Monks and canons in lesser monasteries	1,500
Nuns according to estimate...	1,560
		Total ... 8,081

and thousands of lay people, when they saw the shrines they honoured, the houses of God, which had been to them a rest and a delight, profaned, despoiled and brought to destruction?

This chapter in the tale of ruin may be fitly closed in the words of one who deeply felt its sadness and its meaning. What he says of the abbey of St. Peter's, Gloucester, holds good of many another home of piety and religion swept away by the tyrant who, if any, deserves the name "the Ruthless." "Having existed for more than eight centuries under different forms, in poverty and in wealth, in meanness and in magnificence, in misfortune and in success, it finally succumbed to the royal will; the day came, and that a drear winter day, when its last mass was sung, its last censer waved, its last congregation bent in rapt and lowly adoration before the altar there, and doubtless as the last tones of that day's evensong died away in the vaulted roof, there were not wanting those who lingered in the solemn stillness of the old massive pile, and who, as the lights disappeared one by one, felt that for them there was now a void which could never be filled, because their old abbey, with its beautiful services, its frequent means of grace, its hospitality to strangers and its loving care for God's poor, had passed away like an early morning dream, and was gone for ever."*

* "Hist. et Cart. Mon. S. Petri Gloucestræ," (Chronicles and Mem.) edited by the late W. H. Hart, iii., Introduction, xlix.

CHAPTER IX.

THE THREE BENEDICTINE ABBOTS.*

THE circumstances attending the fall of Glastonbury, Reading and Colchester are deserving of special record. By the autumn of 1539 Henry's designs upon the monastic property had so far succeeded that comparatively few houses still remained in the possession of their religious owners. County after county was laid desolate by the royal commissioners, and the monks and nuns turned from their homes. Every expedient was resorted to in order to obtain the so-called voluntary surrenders† of houses and property into the king's hand, and few, indeed, were found bold enough to withstand the royal methods of persuasion. Where resistance was offered, the ready process of attainder, with its accompanying confiscation of the common goods of a monastic corporation, which, "against every principle of received law,"‡ was held to follow upon the treason,

* Some portions of this chapter, especially with respect to abbot Whiting, have already appeared in an article published in the "Dublin Review," July, 1887. For valuable assistance in this portion of his subject the author is indebted to Dom J. G. Dolan, of Downside.

† "A step of very questionable legality."—Hallam, "Const. Hist.," 10th ed., i., p. 72.

‡ *Ibid.*

supposed or real, of the superior came to effect what the threats or promises of the royal officials had been unable to accomplish. Some examples of the working of the mysterious law of attainder in bringing about the desired end have been already given. The execution of the three mitred abbots of Glastonbury, Reading and Colchester and the seizure of the great possessions of these abbeys by virtue of their attainder for treason are instances of the working of Henry's laws which cannot be passed over.

Few spots in England were counted more sacred than Glastonbury. To the people of pre-reformation days it was a "Roma secunda." The scene, according to mediæval legend, of the burial of St. Joseph of Arimathea and the home of the earliest followers of Christ in this land of Britain, Avalon or Glastonbury had become recognized as the principal sanctuary of the island. Almost alone among the churches of Britain it was spared by the destroying hands of the invaders, and when St. Augustine came from pope St. Gregory to plant the faith it was already associated with the names of St. Patrick and St. David. For a period St. Paulinus is said to have been at this renowned sanctuary before setting out for the scene of his apostolate in northern England. Rendered more famous in later times by the fame and virtues of St. Dunstan, the abbey of Glastonbury was the centre of the monastic revival which marked the reign of Edgar the Pacific. With varying fortune but with unbroken life the monastery

continued to flourish till, at the close of the year 1539, the venerable Richard Whiting, the last of a long line of abbots, was hanged as a traitor to Henry VIII., and its possessions thus passed into the royal power.

It is, perhaps, difficult to understand fully why abbot Whiting was singled out as an example of the royal severity. It was "probably," writes an historian, "to show forcibly the overpowering character of the royal will by destroying an ecclesiastic of immense moral weight and territorial influence. To adopt the language used ten years before respecting his friend Wolsey, the abbot of Glastonbury was probably considered to be the 'bell-wether' of the mitred abbots, and when he had fallen the others would be without hope and an easy prey."*

Richard Whiting had been appointed to succeed abbot Bere in 1525.† Cardinal Wolsey was at that

* J. H. Blunt, "The Reformation," p. 345.

† The family of Whiting was connected by blood with that of bishop Stapleton of Exeter, the well-known benefactor of Exeter College, Oxford. In its principal branch it was possessed of considerable estates in Somerset as well as Devon; but Richard Whiting probably came from a younger and less important part of the family, which, amongst other property, held certain lands as tenants of Glastonbury abbey, in the valley of Wrington. About the time of Richard Whiting's birth, another Richard of the name held the office of *camerarius* in the monastery of Bath (Reg. Beckington at Wells, p. 311). At the beginning of the troubles of the religious houses in Henry's reign Jane, daughter of John Whiting, "was shorn and had taken the habit as a nun in the monastery of Wilton" (R. O. Chancery Inq. P.M., 21 Hen. VIII., 154), and when the new foundations for English conventual life had been established in

time in the zenith of his power, and the community requested him to elect a superior. After a fortnight's delay the cardinal declared Whiting the object of his choice, describing him as "an upright and religious monk, besides a provident and discreet man; a priest commendable for his life, virtues and learning." "He has already proved himself," so runs the document of his appointment, watchful and circumspect "in both spirituals and temporals, and has knowledge and determination to uphold the rights of his monastery."* The appointment was, after certain formalities had been complied with, followed on March 28th, 1525, by the benediction of the new abbot in the church at Glastonbury by Dr. William Gilbert, abbot of Bruton and bishop of Mayo in Ireland, at that time acting as suffragan to bishop John Clarke, of Bath and Wells.†

foreign countries, three of abbot Whiting's nieces became postulants in the English Franciscan house of Bruges (Oliver's Collections, p. 135.)

* Adam de Domerham, ed. Hearne, No. 7, Ap. xcvi.

† The account of abbot Whiting's election is to be found at the end of the register of bp. Clarke (dioc. Bath and Wells). See also "Dublin Rev.," July, 1887, p. 83, etc. The date of Whiting's birth is uncertain. The earliest record is the date of taking his M.A. degree in 1483 (Cooper, "Ath. Cantab.," I. p. 71). He received minor orders in Sept., 1498. In the two succeeding years he was made sub-deacon and deacon, and on 6th March, 1501, was ordained priest by Dr. Cornish, titular bishop of Tinos, a suffragan of Dr. Oliver King, bishop of Bath and Wells (*vide* Reg. O. King). Whiting had in all probability been educated in the abbey school, where, as the learned antiquary, Hearne, says, "the monks of Glastonbury kept a free school, where poor men's sons were bred

The position of abbot of Glastonbury was one of great dignity. The abbey was among the largest and richest monasteries in the kingdom, and the church was exceeded in length only by old St. Paul's among the fanes of England. The abbot was a great local magnate, a peer of parliament, and the master of vast estates. Four parks teeming with game, domains and manors of great extent and number, bringing to the monastery an income of more than £3,000 a year in money, or ten times that amount in our money, gave him an influence of the highest importance in the west and even all England.

What the monastic buildings themselves were can be well imagined. "The house is great, goodly and so princely as we have not seen the like,"* write those sent to seize the possessions for Henry. The library filled Leland with amazement. It was second to none in the land, and he had scarcely passed the threshold when the very sight of so many treasures of antiquity struck him with such awe that for a moment he hesitated to enter. He spent days making a list of the most valuable manuscripts.†

up, as well as gentlemen's, and were fitted for the universities" ("Hist. of Glaston.," pref.).

* State Pap., i., p. 620.

† Cf. Walcott's "Engl. Minsters," ii., 129. The antiquary spoke of abbot Whiting as "homo sane candidissimus et amicus meus singularis," "and though," says Warner ("Hist. of Glastonbury," p. 219), "the too cautious antiquary in after times passed his pen through this language of praise and kindness, lest it should be offensive to his contemporaries, yet happily for the abbot's fame

To the great gate of the abbey every Wednesday and Friday the poor flocked for relief in their necessities, and as many as five hundred persons are said to have been at times entertained at the abbot's table. "The dependent churches required a monastic archdeacon and a special armoury was necessary to equip the force at the disposal of the crown, for there were 1,274 able men being always in a readiness to serve the king when called upon, and 1,271 bondmen of blood, ready to serve the king with 500 pair of harness."

The rule of abbot Whiting over the vast establishment at Glastonbury had to be exercised in very difficult times. Within a few months of his election Sir Thomas Boleyn was created by Henry viscount Rochfort, and this marked the first step in the king's illicit affection for the new peer's daughter, Anne, and the beginning of the troubles of Church and State. Four years of wavering counsels on the great matter of the desired divorce led in 1529 to the humiliation and fall of the hitherto all-powerful cardinal of York.

The sequel is well known. The clergy, caught in the cunningly-contrived snare of premunire, were at the king's mercy. With his hands upon their throats Henry demanded, what in the quarrel with Rome was at the time a retaliation upon the pope for his

the tribute is still legible and will remain for ages a sufficient evidence of the sacrifice of a guileless victim to the tyranny of a second Ahab."

refusal to accede to the royal wishes, the acknowledgment of the king as supreme head of the Church in England. Few among the English churchmen were found bold enough to resist this direct demand, or who even, perhaps, recognized how they were rejecting papal supremacy in matters spiritual. As a rule, the required oath of royal supremacy was apparently taken wherever it was tendered, and the abbots and monks of Colchester, of Glastonbury, and probably also of Reading, were no exception, and on September 19, 1534, abbot Whiting and his community attached their names to the required declaration.

It is easy, after this lapse of time, and in the light of subsequent events, to be loud in reprobation of such compliance; to wonder how throughout England the blessed John Fisher and Thomas More, and the Observants, almost alone, should have been found from the beginning neither to hesitate nor waver. It is easy to make light of the shrinking of flesh and blood, easy to extol the palm of martyrdom. But it is not difficult, too, to see how to abbot Whiting, no less than to blessed John Houghton and his other holy companions of the Charter House, reasons suggested themselves for temporizing. To most men at that date the possibility of a final separation from Rome must have seemed incredible. They remembered Henry in his earlier days, when he was never so immersed in business or in pleasure that he did not hear three or even five masses a

day; they did not know him as Wolsey or Crumwell, or as More or Fisher knew him; the project must have seemed a momentary aberration, under the influence of evil passion or evil counsellors. He had at bottom a zeal for the faith and would return by-and-bye to a better mind, a truer self, and would then come to terms with the pope. Meantime the oath was susceptible of lenient interpretation. The idea of the headship was not absolutely new: it had in a measure been conceded some years before, without, so far as appears, exciting remonstrance from Rome. Beyond this, to many the oath of royal supremacy of the Church of England was never understood as derogatory to the see of Rome. While even those who had taken this oath were in many instances surprised that it should be construed into any such hostility.*

However strained this temper of mind may appear to us at this time, it undoubtedly existed. One example may be here cited. Among the State Papers in the Record Office for the year 1539 is a long harangue on the execution of the three Benedictine abbots in which the writer refers to such a view:—

I cannot think the contrary [he writes], but the old bishop of London [Stokesley], when he was on live, used

* Calendar, viii., Nos. 277, 387, &c., are instances of the temper of mind described above. No. 387 especially is very significant as showing the *gloss* men put on their supremacy oath, distinguishing tacitly between Church of England and Catholic Church, and "in temporalibus," and "in spiritualibus."

the pretty medicine that his fellow, friar Forest, was wont to use, and to work with an inward man and an outward man; that is to say, to speak one thing with their mouth and then another thing with their heart. Surely a very pretty medicine for popish hearts. But it worked madly for some of their parts. Gentle Hugh Cook by his own confession used not the self-same medicine that friar Forest used, but another much like unto it, which was this: what time as the spirituality were sworn to take the king's grace for the supreme head, immediately next under God of this Church of England, Hugh Cook receiving the same oath added prettily in his own conscience these words following: "of the temporal church," saith he, "but not of the spiritual church."*

Nor from another point of view is this want of appreciation as to the true foundation of the papal primacy a subject for unmixed astonishment. During the last half-century the popes had reigned in a court of unexampled splendour, but a splendour essentially mundane. It was a dazzling sight, but all this outward show made it difficult to recognize the divinely ordered spiritual prerogatives which are the enduring heritage of the successors of St. Peter. The dignified titles expressing those prerogatives might pass unquestioned in the schools and in common speech in the world, but from this there is a wide step to the apprehension of the living truths they express, and a yet further step to that intense personal realization which makes those truths dearer to a man than life.†

* R. O. State Papers., Dom., 1539, ^v307, p. 23.

† The words of cardinal Manning on this point may be here quoted:—"It must not be forgotten that at this time the minds of

To some that realization came sooner, to some later; some men there are who seize at once the point at issue and its full import. They are ready with their answer without seeking or faltering. Others answer to the call at the third, maybe the eleventh hour; the cause is the same, and so is the reward, though to the late comer the respite may perhaps have been only a prolongation of the agony.

The royal visitation of Glastonbury was conducted by Layton. He came to the abbey on Saturday August 21st, 1535, and from St. Augustine's,

men had been so distracted by the great western schism, by the frequent subtraction of obedience, by the doubtful election of popes, and the simultaneous existence of two or even three claimants to the holy see, that the supreme pontifical authority had become a matter of academical discussion *hinc inde*. Nothing but such preludes could have instigated even Gerson to write on the thesis *de Auferabilitate Papæ*. This throws much light on the singular fact attested by Sir Thomas More in speaking to the jury and the judge by whom he was condemned, when the verdict of death was brought in against him: 'I have, by the grace of God, been always a Catholic, never out of communion with the Roman Pontiff; but I have heard it said at times that the authority of the Roman Pontiff was certainly lawful and to be respected, but still an authority derived from human law, and not standing upon a divine prescription. Then, when I observed that public affairs were so ordered that the sources of the power of the Roman Pontiff would necessarily be examined, I gave myself up to a most diligent examination of that question for the space of seven years, and found that the authority of the Roman Pontiff, which you rashly—I will not use stronger language—have set aside, is not only lawful, to be respected, and necessary, but also grounded on the divine law and prescription. That is my opinion; that is the belief in which, by the grace of God, I shall die.' ("Dublin Rev.," Jan., 1888, p. 245).

Bristol, whither he departed on the following Monday, he wrote to Crumwell a letter showing that even he, chief among a crew who "could ask unmoved such questions as no other human being could have imagined or known how to put, who could extract guilt from a stammer, a tremble or a blush, or even from indignant silence as surely as from open confession"*—even Layton retired baffled from Glastonbury under the venerable abbot Whiting's rule, though he covered his defeat with impudence unabashed. "At Bruton and Glastonbury," he explains, "there is nothing notable, the brethren be so straight kept that they cannot offend: but fain they would if they might, as they confess, and so the fault is not with them."†

At this period it would seem that Richard Layton also spoke to the king in praise of abbot Whiting. For this error of judgment, when some time later Crumwell had assured himself of the abbot's temper, he was forced to sue for pardon from both king and minister. "I must therefore," he writes, "now in this my necessity most humbly beseech your lordship to pardon me for that my

* Dixon, i., p. 357.

† Wright, p. 59. Godwin, the Protestant bishop of Hereford, says that the monks, "following the example of the ancient fathers, lived apart from the world religiously and in peace, eschewing worldly employments, and wholly given to study and contemplation;" and Sander, writing when the memory of the life led at Glastonbury was still fresh in men's minds, says that the religious were noted for their maintenance of common life, choral observance and enclosure.

folly then committed, as ye have done many times before, and of your goodness to instigate the king's highness majesty, in the premises."*

Hardly had the royal inquisitor departed than it was found at Glastonbury, as elsewhere, that the injunctions were not merely impracticable, but subversive of the first principles of religious discipline. Whiting, like so many religious superiors at this time, begged for some mitigation. Nicholas Fitzjames, a neighbour, wrote an urgent letter to Crumwell in support of the abbot's petition, and a month later the abbot himself ventured to present a grievance of another kind, affecting others besides his community. The suspension of the jurisdiction which had been exercised by the abbey over the town of Glastonbury and its dependencies had caused the gravest inconvenience. There are many "poor people," the abbot writes, "who are waiting to have their causes tried," and he adds that he cannot believe Henry's pleasure has been rightly stated in Dr. Layton's orders.†

The letters of abbot Whiting which still exist, for the most answers to applications for benefices or offices in his gift, are marked by a courteous readiness to comply in everything up to the limits of the possible. It is evident, moreover, that he had an intimate concern in all the details of the complex administration of a monastery of such extent and importance, no less than a determining personal in-

* R. O. Crum. Corr., Vol. xx., No. 14. † *Ibid.*, xiii., f. 58.

fluence on the religious character of his community ; and that public calls were never allowed to come between him and the primary and immediate duties of the abbot. He is most at home in his own country, among his Somersetshire neighbours, and in the "straight" charge of his spiritual children. Confident too in the affection with which he was regarded by the population, he had no scruples, whatever may have been his mind in subscribing to the Supremacy declaration of 1534, in securing for his monks and his townsfolk in his own abbey church the preaching of a doctrine wholly opposed to the royal theories and wishes on the subject. Thus on a Sunday in the middle of February, 1536, a friar called John Brynstan, preaching in the abbatial church at Glastonbury to the people of the neighbourhood, said " he would be one of them that should convert the new fangles and new men, otherwise he would die in the quarrel."*

Knowing doubtless what would be the nature of its business, abbot Whiting, excusing himself on the plea of age and ill-health, did not attend the parliament of 1539, which, so far as it could do, sealed the fate of the monasteries as yet unsuppressed. He awaited the end on his own ground and in the midst of his own people. He was still as solicitous about the smallest details of his care as if the glorious abbey were to last *in ævum*. Thus an interesting account of abbot Whiting at

* Calendar, x., 318.

Glastonbury is given in an examination about a debt, held some years after the abbot's execution. John Watts, "late monk and chaplain to the abbot," said that John Lyte, the supposed debtor, had paid the money "in manner and form following. That is to say, he paid £10 of the said £40 to the said abbot in the little parlour upon the right hand within the great hall, the Friday after New Year's Day before the said abbot was attainted. The said payment was made in gold" in presence of the witness and only one other: "for it was immediately after the said abbot had dined, so that the abbot's gentlemen and other servants were in the hall at dinner." . . . Also "upon St. Peter's day at mid-summer, being a Sunday, in the garden of the said abbot at Glastonbury, whilst high mass was singing," the debtor "made payment" of the rest. "And at that time the abbot asked of the said master Lyte whether he would set up the said abbot's arms in his new buildings that he had made. And the said master Lyte answered the said abbot that he would; and so at that time the said abbot gave unto the said Mr. Lyte eight angels nobles. . . .

"And at the payment of the £30 there was in the garden at that time the lord Stourton. . . . I suppose," continues the witness, "that the said lord Stourton saw not the payment made to the abbot, for the abbot got him into an arbour of bay in the said garden and there received his money. And very glad he was at that time that it was paid

in gold for the short telling, as also he would not, by his will, have it seen at that time."* Thus too almost the last glimpse afforded of the last abbot of Glastonbury in his time-honoured home shows him in friendly converse with his near neighbour, lord Stourton: the head of an ancient race which popular tradition had justly linked for centuries with the Benedictine order, and which even in the darkest days of modern English Catholicity proved itself a firm and hereditary friend.†

To understand the closing acts of the venerable abbot's life it is necessary to premise a few words on suppression in its legal aspect. There seems to be abroad an impression that the monasteries were dissolved by Parliament, and accordingly that a refusal of surrender, such as is found at Glastonbury, was an act, however morally justifiable as a refusal to betray a trust, and even heroic when resistance entailed the last penalty, yet in defiance of the law of the land. And, for instance, in this particular case of Glastonbury, that when insisting on its surrender the king was only requiring that to be given up into his hands which parliament had already conferred on him. However common the impression, it is not accurate.

* R. O. Exch. Augt. Off. Misc. Bk., xxii., Nos. 13-18. In view of the circumstance of the time it seems likely that the witness was anxious to ward off any possibility of lord Stourton being mixed up in the affair. This anxiety to save friends from embarrassing examinations is a very common feature in documents of this date.

† For the first may be seen Hoare's "*Modern Wiltshire.*" The evidence of the second is written in the domestic annals of my own house of St. Gregory's.

What the act (27 Hen. VIII., cap. 28) of February, 1536, did was to give to the king and his heirs only such monasteries as were under the yearly value of £200, or such as should within a "year next after the making of" the act "be given or granted to his majesty by any abbot," etc. So far, therefore, from giving to the king the goods of all the monasteries, the act distinctly recognizes, at least in the case of all save the lesser ones, the rights of their present owners, and contemplates their passing to the king's hands by the cession of the actual possessors. How this surrender was to be brought about was left to the king and Cromwell, and the minions on whose devices there is no need to dwell. Before a recalcitrant superior, who would yield neither to blandishments, bribery nor threats, the king, so far as the act would help him, was powerless.

For this case, however, provision was made, though but indirectly, in the act of April, 1539 (31 Hen. VIII., cap. 13). This act, which included a retrospective clause covering the illegal suppression of the greater monasteries, grants to him all monasteries, etc., etc., which shall hereafter happen to be dissolved, suppressed, renounced, relinquished, forfeited, given up or come into the king's highness. These terms seem wide enough, but there is an ominous parenthesis referring to such others as "shall happen to come to the king's highness by attainder or attainders of treason." The clause did not find its way into the act unawares. We shall

see it was Crumwell's care how and in whose case it was to become operative. And with just so much of countenance as is thus given him by the act, with the king to back him, the monasteries of Glastonbury, Reading and Colchester, from which no surrender could be obtained, "were, against every principle of received law, held to fall by the attainder of their abbots for high treason."*

The very existence of the clause is, moreover, evidence that by this time Crumwell knew that among the superiors of the few monasteries yet standing there were men with whom, if the king was not to be balked of his intent, the last conclusions would have to be tried. To him the necessity would have been paramount, by every means in his power, to sweep away what he rightly regarded as the strongholds of the papal power in the country, and to get rid of these "spies of the pope."† Such unnatural enemies of their prince and gracious lord would fittingly be singled out first, that their fate might serve as a warning to other intending evil-doers. Perhaps, too, Whiting's repute for blamelessness of life, the discipline which he was known to maintain in his monastery and his great territorial influence may all have gone to point him out as an eminently proper subject to proceed against, as showing that where the crime of resistance to the king's will was concerned there could be no such

* Hallam, "Constit. Hist.," i., 72.

† R. O. Crum. Corr., xv., No. 7.

thing as an extenuating circumstance, no consideration which could mitigate the penalty.

In the story of what follows we are continually hampered by the singularly defective nature of the various records relating to the closing years of Crumwell's administration. This holds good in particular with regard to the three Benedictine abbots who suffered in 1539. We are, therefore, frequently left to supply links by conjectures, but conjectures in which, from the broad facts of the case, and such documentary evidence as remains, there is sufficient assurance of being in the main correct.

It was in the autumn that final steps began to be taken in regard to the monastery of Glastonbury and its venerable abbot. Among Crumwell's "remembrances" of things to do, or to speak to the king about, still extant in his own hand-writing, about the beginning of September this year occurs the following: "Item. For proceeding against the abbots of Reading, Glaston and the other in their countries."* From this it is clear that some time between the passing of the act in April, and September, these abbots must have been sounded, and it had been found that compliance was not to be expected.† By the sixteenth of this

* B. Mus. Coll. MS. Titus, B. i., f. 446a.

† At this time Glastonbury, in common with other churches in England, was relieved of what it pleased the king to consider "superfluous plate." Pollard, Tregonwell and Petre on May 2nd, 1539, handed to Sir John Williams, the keeper of the royal treasure-house, 493 ounces of gold, 16,000 ounces of gilt plate, and

latter month Crumwell's design had been communicated to his familiar Layton, and had elicited from him a reply in which he abjectly asks pardon for having praised the abbot at the time of the visitation. "The abbot of Glastonbury," he adds, "appeareth neither then nor now to have known God, nor his prince nor any part of a good Christian man's religion."* Three days later, on Friday, September 19, the royal commissioners, Layton, Pollard and Moyle, suddenly arrived at Glastonbury about ten o'clock in the morning. The abbot had not been warned of their intended visit, and was then at his grange of Sharpham, about a mile from the monastery. Thither they hurried "without delay," and after telling him their purpose, at once examined him "upon certain articles, and for that his answer was not then to our purpose, we advised him to call to his remembrance that which he had forgotten, and so declare the truth."† Then they at 28,700 ounces of parcel gilt and silver plate taken from the monasteries in the west of England. In this amount was included the superfluous plate of Glastonbury. Besides this weight of gold and silver there was placed in the treasury "two collets of gold wherein standeth two coarse emeralds; a cross of silver gilt, garnished with a great coarse emerald two 'balaces' and two sapphires lacking a knob at one of the ends of the same cross; a superaltar garnished with silver gilt and part gold called the great sapphire of Glastonbury; a great piece of unicorn's horn, a piece of mother of pearl like a shell, eight branches of coral" (Monastic Treasures, Abbotsford Club, p. 24).

* The whole of this account is from the letter of the commissioners to Crumwell, in Wright, p. 255.

† Ellis, Orig. Letters, 3rd Series, iii.

once took him back to the abbey, and when night came on proceeded to search the abbot's papers, and ransack his apartments "for letters and books, and found in his study, secretly laid, as well a written book of arguments against the divorce of the king's majesty and the lady dowager, which we take to be a great matter, as also divers pardons, copies of bulls, and the counterfeit life of Thomas Becket in print; but we could not find any letter that was material."

Furnished with these pieces of evidence as to the tendency of Whiting's opinions, the inquisitors proceeded further to examine him concerning the "articles we received from your lordship" (Crumwell). In his answers appeared, they considered, "his cankered and traitorous mind against the king's majesty and his succession." To these replies he signed his name, "and so with as fair words as" they could, "being but a very weak man and sickly," they forthwith sent him up to London to the Tower, that Crumwell might examine him again.

The rest of the letter is significant for the purpose they knew their master would regard as most important:—

As yet we have neither discharged servant nor monk; but now, the abbot being gone, we will, with as much celerity as we may, proceed to the dispatching of them. We have in money £300 and above; but the certainty of plate and other stuff there as yet we know not, for we have not had opportunity for the same; whereof we shall ascertain your lordship so shortly as we may. This is also to advertise your lordship that we have found a fair chalice of gold, and divers

other parcels of plate, which the abbot had hid secretly from all such commissioners as have been there in times past; and as yet he knoweth not that we have found the same; whereby we think that he thought to make his hand by his untruth to his king's majesty.

A week later, on September 28,* they again write to Crumwell that they "have daily found and tried out both money and plate," hidden in secret places in the abbey, and conveyed for safety to the country. They could not tell him how much they had so far discovered, but it was sufficient, they thought, to have "begun a new abbey," and they conclude by asking what the king will have done in respect to the two monks who were the treasurers of the church, and the two lay clerks of the sacristy, who were chiefly to be held responsible in the matter.

On the 2nd October the inquisitors write again to their master to say that they have come to the knowledge of "divers and sundry treasons" committed by abbot Whiting, "the certainty whereof shall appear unto your lordship in a book herein enclosed, with the accusers' names put to the same, which we think to be very high and rank treasons." The original letter, preserved in the Record Office, clearly shows by the creases in the soiled yellow paper that some small book or folded papers have been enclosed. Whatever it was, it is no longer forthcoming, and, as far as can be ascertained, is lost or destroyed. Just at the critical moment we

* Wright, p. 257.

are deprived, therefore, of the most interesting sources of information. In view, however, of the common sufferings of these abbots, who were dealt with together, their common cause, the common fate which befell them, and the common cause assigned by contemporary writers for their death—viz., their attainder “of high treason for denying the king to be supreme head of the Church,” as Hall, the contemporary London lawyer, phrases it, there can be little doubt that these depositions were much of the same nature as those made against Thomas Marshall, abbot of Colchester, to which subsequent reference will be made. It is certain that with abbot Whiting in the Tower and Crumwell’s commissioners engaged in “dispatching” the monks “with as much celerity” as possible, Glastonbury was already regarded as part of the royal possessions. Even before any condemnation the matter is taken as settled, and on October 24th, 1539, Pollard handed over to the royal treasurer the riches still left at the abbey as among the possessions of “attainted persons and places.”*

Whilst Layton and his fellows were rummaging at Glastonbury, abbot Whiting was safely lodged in the Tower of London. There he was subjected to searching examinations. A note in Crumwell’s own hand, entered in his “remembrances,” says :

* *Monastic Treasures*, Abbotsford Club, p. 38. These consisted of 71 ozs. of gold with stones, 7,214 ozs. of gilt plate, and 6,387 ozs. of silver.

“Item. Certain persons to be sent to the Tower for the further examination of the abbot of Glaston.”*

At this time it was supposed that parliament, which ought to have met on November 1 of this year, would be called upon to consider the charges against the abbot. At least Marillac, the French ambassador, who shows that he was always well informed on public matters, writes to his master that this is to be done. Even when the assembly was delayed till the arrival of the king's new wife, Ann of Cleves, he repeats that the decision of Whiting's case will now be delayed. He adds that “they have found a manuscript in favour of queen Catherine, and against the marriage of queen Anne, who was afterwards beheaded,” which is objected against the abbot.† Poor Catherine had been at rest in her grave for four years, and her rival in the affections of Henry had died on the scaffold nearly as many years before Layton and his fellow-inquisitors found the written book of arguments in Whiting's study, and “took it to be a great matter” against him. It is hardly likely that, even if more loyal to Catherine's memory than there is any possible reason to suppose, he would stick at a point where More and Fisher could yield and would not give in to the succession. But as in their case, it was the thorny questions which surrounded the divorce, the subject all perilous of “treason,” which

* B. Mus. Coll. MS. Titus, B. i., f. 441 a.

† “Inventaire Analytique,” *ut sup.*, No. 161.

brought him at last, as it brought them first, to the scaffold.

It is more than strange that the ordinary procedure was in this case never carried out. According to all law, Whiting and the abbots of Reading and Colchester should have been arraigned for treason before parliament, as they were members of the House of Peers, but no such "bill of attainder" was ever presented, and in fact the execution had taken place before the parliament came together.*

The truth is, that Whiting and the other abbots were condemned to death as the result of the secret inquisitions in the Tower. Crumwell, acting as "prosecutor, judge and jury,"† had arranged for their execution before they left their prison. What happened in the case of Whiting at Wells, and with Cook at Reading, was a ghastly mockery of justice, enacted merely to cover the illegal and iniquitous proceedings which had condemned them untried. This Crumwell has written down with his own hand. He notes in his "remembrances" :—‡

Item. Councillors to give evidence against the abbot of Glaston, Richard Pollard, Lewis Forstell and Thomas Moyle.
Item. To see that the evidence be *well sorted* and the indictments *well drawn* against the said abbots and their accom-

* According to Wriothesley's "Chronicle" they were arraigned in the "Counter." "Also in this month [November] the abbates of Glastonburie, Reding and Colchester were arrayned in the Counter."

† Froude, Hist., iii., p. 432.

‡ *Ut sup.*, ff. 441 a and b.

plices. Item. How the king's learned counsel shall be with me all this day,* for the full conclusion of the indictments.

And then, to sum up all:—

Item. The abbot of Glaston to be *tried* at Glaston, and *also executed* there.

But amidst these cares Crumwell never forgot the king's business, the "great matter," the end which

* In curious agreement with the care of Crumwell in devoting the whole of one of his precious days to the final settlement of the indictment against the abbots, is the solicitude of his panegyrist Burnet (from whom, be it said, in fact though unwittingly, even Catholics have derived their ideas of so many men and events of the Reformation period) to "discover the impudence of Sanders" in his relation in the matter of the abbots' suffering for denying the king's supremacy, and to prove that they did not. It would take up too much space here to expose the mingled "impudence" and fraud of his own account of the matter. It may suffice to quote Collier on this point: "What the particulars were (of the abbots' attainder) our learned Church historian (Burnet) confesses 'he can't tell; for the record of their attainders is lost.' But, as he goes on, 'some of our own writers (Hall, Grafton) deserve a severe censure, who write it was for denying, etc., the king's supremacy. Whereas if they had not undertaken to write the history without any information at all, they must have seen that the whole clergy, and especially the abbots, had over and over again acknowledged the king's supremacy.' But how does it appear our historians are mistaken? Has this gentleman seen the abbot of Colchester's indictment or perused his record of attainder? He confesses no. How then is his censure made good? He offers no argument beyond conjecture. He concludes the abbot of Colchester had formerly acknowledged the king's supremacy, and from thence infers he could not suffer now for denying it. But do not people's opinions alter sometimes, and conscience and courage improve? Did not bishop Fisher and cardinal Pool, at least as this author represents them, acknowledge the king's supremacy at first? and

this iniquity was to compass. With the prize now fairly within his grasp, he notes :—

The plate of Glastonbury, 11,000 ounces and over, besides golden. The furniture of the house of Glaston. In ready money from Glaston, £1,100 and over. The rich copes from Glaston. The whole year's revenue of Glaston. The debts of Glaston, £2,000 and above.*

Layton has borne witness to the state of spirituals in Glastonbury; Crumwell gives final testimony to the abbot's good administration of temporals. The house by this time had, according to Crumwell's construction, come to the king's highness by attainder of treason. It remained now to inaugurate the line of policy on which Elizabeth improved later, and after, in the secret tribunal of the Tower, condemning him without trial for cause of conscience in a sentence that involved forfeiture of life and goods, to put him to death, if Sir John Russell is to be

yet 'tis certain they afterwards showed themselves of another mind to a very remarkable degree. . . . Farther, does not himself tell us that many of the Carthusians were executed for their open denying the king's supremacy [which it may be added they had previously admitted], and why then might not some of the abbots have the same belief and fortitude with others of their fraternity?" ("Eccl. Hist.," ii., 173.) Hence, counter to Burnet's method of making abbot Whiting suffer for "burglary" and imaginary treasonable connection with the Pilgrimage of Grace, Collier asserts "neither bribery nor terror nor any other dishonourable motives could prevail" with the abbots of Colchester, Reading and Glastonbury. "To reach them, therefore, another way, the oath of supremacy was offered them, and upon their refusal they were condemned for high treason" (p. 164).

* *Ibid.*, f. 446 a.

believed, for common felony, the "robbing of Glastonbury Church." For the moment it is difficult to be serious over such a pretence.

The circumstances of Whiting's last journey homeward must now be told. In face of documentary evidence of unquestionable authenticity it is impossible to credit many of the oft-repeated statements in the second and subsequent editions of Sander's "Schism."* They seem to be of a traditionary character, to embody the gossip of the countryside current half a century later; in some points running near enough to the truth, in others partaking of legend; such as the sensational scene, wanting alike in sense and probability, in the hall of the palace on the abbot's arrival at Wells; the assembly prepared to receive him, his proceeding to take the place of honour among the first, the unexpected summons to stand down and answer to the charge of treason, the old man's wondering inquiry what this meant, the whispered assurance that it was all a matter of form to strike terror—into whom or wherefore the story does not tell.

If it is hard to believe that Henry and Crumwell could amuse themselves by ordering the enactment

* The original edition of Sander simply says that the three abbots and the two priests, Rugg and Onion, "ob negatam Henrici pontificiam potestatem martyrii coronam adepti sunt." In the second and later editions this is cut out, another reason is assigned for their death, and an obviously legendary narrative about Whiting is inserted in the text.

of such a farce, it is more difficult still to conceive of Whiting as the unsuspecting victim of it. As we have seen under Crumwell's hand, his fate was already settled before he left the Tower. In the interrogatories, preliminary but decisive, he had there undergone, the abbot had come face to face with the bare duty imposed on him by conscience at last. He must himself have known to what end the way through the Tower had, from the time of More and Fisher to his own hour, led those who had no other satisfaction to give the king than that which he could offer. It is not impossible, however, that hopes may have been held out to him that in his extreme old age and weakness of body he might be spared extremities; this supposition seems to be countenanced by the account given below. Is the suggestion too horrible that Henry may have remembered Wolsey's end,* and have reflected that the death of the abbot in similar circumstances, before the last penalty was paid to his law, would render useless the pains taken to make a terrible example. It is probable that the following passage, hitherto apparently unnoticed, from an unknown but contemporary writer, represents much more accurately the real facts of the case, than the pseudo-dramatic presentment of the editor of Sander:—

“The death of the abbot of Glastonbury, whose name was

* Wolsey died in the end of fright. Dr. Brewer writes: “His despondency and waning health anticipated the sword of the executioner, and disappointed the malice of his enemies” (Introd. *Cal. Letters and Papers*, Vol. iv., p. 613).

Whiting, was most sad. Called to London to answer calumnies against him, he so purged himself of any offence, as to consider that he had satisfied his examiners and had been acquitted. And going homewards to Glastonbury, had one Pollard appointed to wait upon him, who was an especial favourer of Crumwell, whom the abbot neither desired to accompany him, neither yet dared to refuse him. At the next bait, when the abbot went to wash, he desired Mr. Pollard to come wash with him, who by no means would be entreated thereunto. The abbot seeing such civility mistrusted so much the more such courtesy was not void of some subtilty and said unto him: 'Mr. Pollard if you be to me a companion, I pray you wash with me and sit down; but if you be my keeper and I your prisoner, tell me plainly, that I may prepare my mind to go to another room better fitting my fortunes. And if you be neither, I shall be content to ride without your company.' Whereupon Pollard protested that he did forbear to do what the abbot desired him only in respect of the reverence he bore his age and virtues, and that he was appointed by those in authority to bear him company of worship's sake, and therefore might not forsake him till he did see him safe at Glastonbury.

Notwithstanding all this, the abbot doubted somewhat, and told one (Thomas) Horne, whom he had brought up from a child, that he misdoubted (him) somewhat, Judas having betrayed his master. And yet though (Horne) were both privy and plotter of his master's fall, yet did he swear most intolerably he knew of no harm towards him, neither should any be done to him as long as he was in his company; wishing besides that the devil might have him if he were otherwise than he told him. But before he came to Glastonbury, Horne forsook, and joined himself unto his enemies.*

* B. Mus. Sloane MS. 2495. The passage in the text is taken from an early seventeenth-century life of Henry VIII. It is, however, a free translation of Arundel MS., 151, No. 62, which is a hitherto unnoticed account of the divorce written somewhere about

Some two months after the venerable abbot had been conveyed to London, he was brought back on his homeward journey. He reached Wells on November 14, where there awaited him (Russell is warranty for the fact) "as worshipful a jury as was charged here these many years. And there was never seen in these parts so great an appearance as were here at this present time, and never better willing to serve the king."* Besides the care taken over the indictments, care had been evidently bestowed to make all secure on the spot. The duty of the jury at Wells was marked out in their charge; they might refuse to take the part assigned to them at their peril. No words are wasted over the sentence. Russell, in his report to Crumwell, does not so much as even mention it: "The abbot of Glastonbury was arraigned, and the next day put to execution, with two other of his monks, for the robbing of Glastonbury church."†

On this "next day" (November 15, 1539) the year 1557, and dedicated to Philip and Mary. Some of the details agree with those given about Whiting by Le Grand ("Defense," iii., p. 210), who may have drawn them from the same source.

* Russell to Crumwell, Wright, p. 260. The similarity of the language here used by Russell, and that of Norfolk about the northern jury should be noted (see p. 155 *ante*).

† Hearne, the antiquary, stated of Whiting that "to reach him the oath was offered to him at Wells," and that refusing it he had the "courage to maintain his conscience and run the last extremity" ("Hist. of Glast." p. 50). These are the words of Collier, ii., p. 164. The "offering" the oath at Wells is probably a misunderstanding on the part of Hearne.

aged abbot was taken in his horse litter to Glastonbury.* In his case there was no mercy, no pity. The venerable man, who in a long life had passed through obedience and through honours alike blameless, now bowed under the weight of eighty years, was tied on a hurdle like a common felon and dragged to the top of Tor hill, where with John Thorn and Roger James, two of his monks, he was handed over to the executioner.†

Even here he was not allowed to die in peace. With the ghastly apparatus around—the gallows, the boiling cauldron, the butcher's knife—Pollard pestered him yet once more with “divers articles and interrogatories;” but “he could accuse no man but himself on any offence against the king's highness, nor he would confess no more gold nor silver, nor any other thing more than he did before

* The editor of Sander, consistent throughout, writes: “Glasconiam dimissus est, nihil minus tamen cogitans quam tam celerem sibi vitæ exitum.” A priest approaches to hear his confession; he prays to be spared for a day or two to prepare for death, and to be allowed to say good-bye to his monks; he sheds tears, etc. The authentic report of Pollard is here followed in preference to his narrative.

† Dr. Lee (*Hist. Sketches*, Append. v., p. 419) says: “From a MS. in the handwriting of the late Mr. Sharon Turner it appears that, in looking over certain transcripts from the family collections of the house of Russell, he found the draft of a letter from Sir J. Russell to Crumwell, in which the former admits that the abbot was intentionally executed alone, so as to prevent his receiving any sympathy or aid from his two spiritual sons in the order, who were executed on the same day, and because of his stubbornness and obstinacy.”

your lordship in the Tower."† Then "he asked God mercy and the king for his great offences towards his highness. And thereupon took his death very patiently and his head and body bestowed in like manner as I certified your lordship in my last letter."*

"One quarter standeth at Wells," writes Russell on the following day, November 16, 1539, "another at Bath and at Ilchester and Bridgewater the rest; and his head upon the abbey gate at Glaston"—an example, as a scribbler in Henry's service has put it, "of the rewards and ends of traitors, whereby subjects and servants might learn to know their faithful obedience unto their most dread sovereign lord the king's highness."†

The history of the fall of Reading abbey and the execution of Hugh Cook, or Faringdon, the abbot, is in its main features but a repetition of the story of Glastonbury and abbot Whiting. If we may credit the account of his origin given by a contemporary, abbot Cook appears to have been born in humble circumstances. He thus apostrophises the abbot after his fall: "Ah Hugh Cook, Hugh Cook! nay Hugh Scullion rather I may him call that would be so unthankful to so merciful a prince, so unkind to so loving a king and so traitorous to so true an emperor. The king's highness of his charity took Hugh Cook out of his cankerous cloister and made him, being at that time the most vilest, the most untowardest and

* Wright, p. 261.

† *Ibid.*, p. 260.

the most miserablest monk that was in the monastery of Reading, born to nought else but to an old pair of beggarly boots, and made him, I say ruler and governor of three thousand marks by the year."* But the testimony of the writer on a point of fact such as this cannot be rated high.

It is probable that abbot Cook belonged to that class from which the English monastic houses were so largely recruited, "the devouter and younger children of our nobility and gentry who here had their education and livelihood." † His election to the

* R. O. State Papers, Dom., v. 251. This long harangue seems to have been prepared for delivery or publication soon after the execution of the three abbots. Its purport is first to justify their condemnation on the ground that by their loyalty to the holy see they had been guilty of treason, and secondly to bring them and their fellow sufferers by all means into contempt. As it is the chief document about the abbots, and in particular about the abbot of Reading, which is known to exist, considerable use is here made of it. It is clearly the composition of some tool of Crumwell, probably of some anti-papal preacher.

* Bodleian MS. Wood, B, vi. Woodhope's "Book of Obits." It has been considered doubtful whether the name of the last abbot of Reading was Cook or Faringdon. He is sometimes called by one, sometimes by the other name. In the entry of his conviction for treason upon the Controlment Roll, usually very exact, he is called only by the name of "Cooke." As to the arms borne by the abbot, Cole, the antiquary, writes as follows:—"In a curious MS. Book of Heraldry, on vellum and painted, supposed to (be) written about 1520, containyng all ye arms of Persons who had a chevron in the same, is this entered: Hugh Faringdon, *alias* Cooke, Abbat of Reading. Gules a chevron lozenge sable and argent inter 3 Bezants each charged with a cinquefoil gules, on a chief argent a Dove inter 2 Flowers azure. This book belongs to my Friend Mr. Blomefield of Norwich.—W. C. 1748." (Note in Cole's copy of Browne

office of abbot took place in 1520, and although Grafton and Hall in their chronicles, and some other writers of the Reformation give him the character of an illiterate person, "the contrary will appear to such as will consult his *Epistles to the University of Oxford* remaining in the register of that university or shall have an opportunity of perusing a book entitled *The art or craft of Rhetorick* written by Leonard Cox, schoolmaster of Reading. 'Twas printed in the year 1524, and is dedicated by the author to this abbot. . . . He speaks very worthily and honourably of Faringdon on account of his learning."*

In a letter written by Cook to the university in Oxford in 1530, the abbot's intelligent zeal for the Catholic religion, which at that time was being attacked by the new heresies which were springing up on all sides, is conspicuously displayed. Among the monks of Reading abbey was one D. John Holyman, "a most stout champion in his preach-

Willis' "Mitred Abbeys" (ed. 1718), i., 161, now in possession of the earl of Gainsborough.) These arms, impaled with those of Reading abbey, are also given in Coate's "Reading," plate vii., engraved with a portrait of the abbot, from a piece of stained glass, formerly in Sir John Davis' chapel at Bere Court near Pangbourne. These are the arms of the family of Cook and probably of the Kentish branch.

* Browne Willis, "Mitred Abbeys," i., 161. For Leonard Cox consult "Dict. of National Biography," xii., 136. Among the abbots, priests, monks and nuns whose names appear on the roll of the Palmers Guild of Ludlow is that of "Hugh Farington, monk, now Abbot of Reading." Shrewsbury Archæological Soc., vii., p. 97.

ings and writings against the Lutherans," who, "desirous of a stricter life resigned his fellowship at New College, Oxford and took the cowl at Reading abbey." When Holyman was to receive the doctorate, abbot Cook asked that he might be excused from preaching before the university, as the custom was, so that he might preach in London, where there was greater need of such a man, seeing that the city was already infected with Lutheranism and where the great popularity which Holyman already enjoyed brought crowds to hear him whenever he appeared in the pulpit at St. Paul's.*

On the visitation of Reading abbey by doctor London, in 1535, the report was favourable to the monks. "They have," writes the doctor, "a good lecture in Scripture daily read in their chapter house, both in English and Latin, to which is good resort, and the abbot is at it himself." † Somewhat later Shaxton, bishop of Salisbury, however, objected strongly to the reader, whose name was John London, and whose teaching he considered calculated to keep up the adherence of his hearers to the ancient faith, and in particular, their fidelity to the See of Rome. The substitute he proposed to appoint was resisted by the abbot, because although a priest, he was "married and degraded and thus a

* *Vide* Wood's "Athenæ Oxon" and "Hist. et Antiq. Oxon," lib. i., p. 252. and lib. ii., pp. 95 and 136, for notices of Holyman, who became bishop of Bristol in Mary's reign, and died in 1558.

† Wright, p. 226.

most dangerous man" to hold such a post in a monastery.*

According to the writer of the contemporary document before quoted, abbot Cook "could not abide" the preachers of the new-fangled doctrines then in vogue, and "called them heretics and knaves of the new learning." He was also "ever a great student and setter forth of St. Benet's, St. Francis', St. Dominic's and St. Augustine's rules, and said they were rules right holy and of great perfectness." In fact, "these doughty deacons," as the writer calls the abbots and their companions, "thought it both heresy and treason to God to leave matins unsaid, to speak loud in the cloisters and to eat eggs on the Friday." †

It may be a matter of regret to find the name of abbot Cook among those of the spiritual lords, who, on July 13, 1530, petitioned pope Clement VII. to grant the divorce of Henry and Catherine. In itself, however, the petition was not reprehensible, and only pleaded for Henry's wish if it could be granted with justice. This is, however, scarcely to be wondered at, if, as the contemporary libeller reports, Henry was on terms of familiarity with the abbot of Reading and used to call him "his own abbot."

* See Vol. i., p. 282. This "Roger London," the reader complained of by Shaxton, was a monk of Reading. In a list of "the prisoners names that be in the Tower the 20th day of November," 1539, occurs that of "Roger London, monk of Reading" (B. Mus. Cott. MS. Titus, B. i., f. 133.) The fate of this monk is uncertain.

† R. O. State Papers, Dom., 1539, v. 251.

Humanly speaking, the concession of Henry's demand, had such a thing been possible, might have changed the subsequent ecclesiastical history of England. On the question of the royal supremacy, however, abbot Cook was clear. "He thought to shoot at the king's supremacy," as the contemporary witness has put it, and he was apparently charged with saying "that he would pray for the pope's holiness as long as he lived and would once a week say mass for him, trusting that by such good prayers the pope should rise again and have the king's highness with all the whole realm in subjection as he hath had in time past. And upon a *bon voyage* would call him pope as long as he lived."*

* *Ibid.* After a page of abuse, the writer continues: "I cannot tell how this prayer will be allowed among St. Benet's rules, but this I am certain and sure of, that it standeth flatly against our Master, Christ's, rule. . . . What other thing should the abbat pray for here (as methinketh), but even first and foremost for the high dishonouring of Almighty God, for the confusion of our most dread sovereign lord, king Henry VIII., with his royal successors, and also for the utter destruction of this most noble realm of England. Well, I say no more, but I pray God heartily that the mass be not abused in the like sort of a great many more in England which bear as fair faces under their black cowls and bald crowns as ever did the abbat of Reading, or any of the other traitors. I wiss neither the abbat of Reading, the abbat of Glassenbury, nor the prior [*sic*] of Colchester, Dr. Holyman, nor Roger London, John Rugg, nor Bachelor Giles, blind Moore, nor Master Manchester, the warden of the friars; no, nor yet John Oynyon, the abbat's chief councillor, was able to prove with all their sophistical arguments that the mass was ordained for any such intent or purpose as the abbat of Reading used it."

It would appear probable that abbot Cook did not refuse to take the oath of royal supremacy,* although there can be little doubt that in so doing he did not intend to separate himself from the traditional teaching of the Catholic church on the question of papal authority. "I fear me," writes the authority so often quoted, "Hugh Cook was master Cook to a great many of that blackguard (I mean black monks), and taught them to dress such gross dishes as he was always wont to dress, that is to say, treason; but let them all take heed."†

At the time of the great northern rising, the abbey of Reading, together with those of Glastonbury and Colchester, is found on the list of contributors to the king's expenses in defeating the rebel forces. Reading itself appears to have had some communication with Robert Aske, for copies of a letter

* No actual record exists of this oath, as in the case of Glastonbury, Colchester, etc.

† *Ibid.* The following bears on the same point: "But like as of late by God's purveyance a great part of their religious hoods be already meetly well ripped from their crafty coats, even so I hope the residue of the like religion shall in like sort not long remain unripped, for truly so long as they be let run at riot thus still in religion they think verily that they may play the traitors by authority. . . . But now his grace seeth well enough that all was not gold that glistered, neither all his true subjects that called him lord and master, namely, of Balaam's asses, with the bald crowns. But I would now heartily wish that as many as be of that traitorous religion [*i.e.*, order] that those abbats were of, at the next [assizes?] have their bald crowns as well shaven as theirs were." This testimony to the steadfastness of the Benedictines to the Holy See fully corroborates Collier's statement given above.

written by him, and apparently also his proclamation, were circulated in the town. Amongst others who were supposed to be privy to the intentions of the insurgent chief was John Eynon, a priest of the church of St. Giles', Reading, and a special friend of abbot Cook. Three years later this priest was executed with the abbot, but at the time it is clear that there was no suggestion of any complicity on the part of Cook, as he presided at the examinations held in December, 1536, as to this matter.*

The first sign of any serious trouble appears about the close of 1537. The king's proceedings, which were distasteful to the nation at large, naturally gave rise to much criticism and murmuring. Every overt expression of disapprobation was eagerly watched for and diligently inquired into by the royal officials. The numerous records of examinations as to words spoken in conversation or in sermons evidence the extreme care taken by the government to crush out the first sparks of popular discontent. Rumours as to the king's bad health, or, still more, reports as to his death, were construed into indications of a treasonable disposition. In December, 1537, a rumour of this kind that Henry was dead reached Reading, and abbot Cook wrote to some of his neighbours to tell them what was reported. This act, so natural in itself, was laid to his charge, and Henry acquired a cheap reputation for magnanimity and clemency by pardoning "his own abbot" for

* Calendar, xi., 1231.

what at the very worst, at all times but during this reign of terror, was but a trifling act of indiscretion.*

Circumstances had brought abbot Cook into communication with both the other abbots, whose fate was subsequently linked with his own. In the triennial general chapters of the Benedictines, in parliament, in convocation they had frequently met; and when the more active measures of persecution devised by Cromwell made personal intercourse impossible, a trusty agent was found in the person of a blind harper named Moore, whose affliction and musical skill had brought him under the kindly notice of the king. This staunch friend of the papal party, whose blindness rendered his mission unsuspected, travelled about from one abbey to another, encouraging the imprisoned monks, bearing letters from house to house, and, doubtless, finding a safe way of sending off to Rome the letters which they had written to the pope and cardinals.

But now amongst them all let us talk a word or two of William Moor, the blind harper. Who would have thought

* State Papers Dom., v. 251. This paper thus treats the incident:—
 “For think ye that the abbat of Reading deserved any less than to be hanged, what time as he wrote letters of the king’s death unto divers gentlemen in Berkshire, considering in what a queasy case the realm stood in at that same season? For the insurrection that was in the north country was scarcely yet thoroughly quieted; thus began he to stir the coals *à novo* and to make a fresh roasting fire, and did enough, if God had not stretched forth his helping hand, to set the realm in as great an uproar as ever it was, and yet the king’s majesty, of his royal clemency, forgave him. This had been enough to have made this traitor a true man if there had been any grace in him.”

that he would have consented or concealed any treason against the king's majesty? or who could have thought that he had had any power thereto? Who can muse or marvel enough to see a blind man for lack of sight to grope after treason? Oh! Moor, Moor, hadst thou so great a delight and desire to play the traitor? Is this the mark that blind men trust to hit perchance? Hast thou not heard how the blind eateth many a fly? Couldst not thou beware and have kept thy mouth close together for fear of gnats? Hath God endued thee with the excellency of harping and with other good qualities to put unto such a vile use? Couldst thou have passed the time with none other song but with the harping upon the string of treason? Couldst thou not have considered that the king's grace called thee from the wallet and the staff to the state of a gentleman? Wast thou also learned, and couldst thou not consider that the end of treason is eternal damnation? Couldst thou not be contented truly to serve thy sovereign lord king Henry VIII., whom thou before a great many oughtest and wast most bound truly to serve? Couldst not thou at least for all the benefits received at his grace's hand, bear towards him thy good will? Hadst thou nought else to do but to become a traitorous messenger between abbat and abbat? Had not the traitorous abbats picked out a pretty mad messenger of such a blind buzzard as thou art? Could I blazon thine arms sufficiently although I would say more than I have said? Could a man paint thee out in thy colours any otherwise than traitors ought to be painted? Shall I call thee William Moor, the blind harper? Nay, verily, thou shalt be called William Moor, the blind traitor. Now, surely, in my judgment, God did a gracious deed what time He put out both thine eyes, for what a traitor by all likelihood wouldst thou have been if God had lent thee thy sight, seeing thou wast so willing to grope blindfolded after treason! When thou becomest a traitorous messenger between the traitorous abbats, and when thou tookest in hand to lead traitors in the trade of

treason, then was verified the sentence of our Master, Christ, which sayeth, When the blind lead the blind both shall fall into the ditch. Thou wast blind in thine eyes, and they were blind in their consciences. Wherefore ye be all fallen into the ditch, that is to say, into the high displeasure of God and the king. I wiss, Moor, thou wrestest thine harp-strings clean out of tune and settest thine harp a note too high when thou thoughtest to set the bawdy bishop of Rome above the king's majesty.*

* *Ibid.*, p. 25. "William Moor" appears in a list of prisoners in the Tower 20th November, 1539 (B. Mus. Cott. MS. Titus, B. i., f. 133). The list, as far as Reading names are concerned, runs:—"Roger London, monk of Reading; Peter Lawrence, who was warden of (the) Grey friars, Reading; Gyles Coventry, who was a friar of the same house; George Constantine; Richard Manchester; William Moor, the blind harper." In one of Crumwell's "remembrances" at this time we have "Item to proceed against the abbots of Reading, Glaston, Rugg, Bachyler, London, the Grey friars and Heron" (R. O. State Papers, Dom., 1539, 381). Perhaps Moor is the same person mentioned by Stowe (ed. 1614, p. 582): "The 1 of July (1540) a Welchman, a minstrel, was hanged and quartered for singing of songs which were interpreted to be prophecyng against the king."

To the same period may be attributed the following letter, although the "doctor Coke" mentioned is probably not the abbot of Reading, but Laurence Cook, the Carmelite prior of Doncaster, executed August 4th, 1540. It is written from the Tower to Crumwell: "Doctor Coke and Abell see one of them the other at the church sometimes, but they speak not together. Abell would fain have one of the books, that is made against his book, but without your consent I will deliver him none. The old monk lieth with doctor Coke; the other three as yet lie together. Two of them wear irons and Frythe wears none, although he lacketh irons, he lacketh not wit nor pleasant tongue. His learning passeth my judgment. Sir, as you said, it were great pity to lose him if he may be reconciled. . . . Sir, amongst many other good deeds that ye do, have in your remembrance doctor Coke, Christopher Coe, and William Umpton and other poor prisoners remaining in the Tower,

Abbot Cook, like Whiting of Glastonbury, underwent examination and practical condemnation in the Tower before being sent down to his "country to be tried and executed." What was the head and chief of his offence we may take from the testimony of the hostile witness so freely invoked in this chapter.

"It will make many beware to put their fingers in the fire any more," he says, "either for the honour of Peter and Paul or for the right of the Roman Church. No, not for the pardon of the . . . pope himself, though he would grant more pardon than all the popes that ever were have granted. I think, verily, our mother, holy Church of Rome, hath not so great a jewel of her own darling Reynold Poole as she should have had of these abbats if they could have conveyed all thing, cleanly. Could not our English abbats be contented with English forked caps but must look after Romish cardinal hats also? Could they not be contented with the plain fashion of England but must counterfeit the crafty cardinality of Reynold Poole? Surely they should have worn their cardinal hats with as much shame as that papistical traitor, Reynold Poole. . . . Could not our popish abbats beware of Reynold Poole, of that bottomless whirlpool, I say, which is never satiate of treason?"

which Umpton has been here these fifteen months or thereabouts, unexamined since his coming hither" (R. O. Crum. Corr., Vol. xlvi., No. 21).

From such scanty evidence as may be gathered from these passages, one or two things are made clear. First, that the abbots of Glastonbury, Reading, and Colchester were singled out for execution because of their loyalty to the holy see and their influence with their brethren; secondly, that the venerable Hugh Cook was conspicuous for his devotion to the vicar of Christ, and spite of Henry's favour, and spite of his threats, would never in his heart accept the king's supremacy, but week by week would offer the holy sacrifice on behalf of the bishop of Rome, and call him pope till his dying day.

When carried down to Reading for the mockery of justice, called a trial, the abbot did not waver in his determination. "When these traitors were arraigned at the bar, although they had confessed before and written it with their own hands that they had committed high treason against the king's majesty, yet they found all the means they could to go about to try themselves true men, which was impossible to bring to pass."

On November 15th, the same day upon which abbot Whiting suffered at Glastonbury,* the abbot of

* Some give November 14th as the date of the execution. Browne-Willis says: "Hugh Farington, opposing the surrender of this abbey at the dissolution, *an.* 1539, and also refusing to attest the king's supremacy, became attainted of high treason," and was executed "at Reading, November 14, 1539, at which time two of his monks, Rugg and Onion, suffered with him." *Vide* also "Monasticon," Vol. iv.; Holinshed (ed. 1586), iii., p. 948. Some authorities make abbot Whiting's execution the 14th (B. Mus. Add. MS., 27,402, f. 47).

Reading and two priests were brought out to suffer the death of traitors. Abbot Cook, standing in the space before the gateway of his abbey, spoke to the people who, in great numbers, had gathered to witness the strange spectacle of the execution of a lord abbot of the great and powerful monastery of Reading. He told them of the cause for which he and his companions were to die, not fearing openly to profess that which Henry's laws made it treason to hold—fidelity to the see of Rome, which he declared was but the common faith of those who had the best right to know what was the true teaching of the English Church. "The abbot of Reading," says the old authority, "at the day of his death, lamenting the miserable end that he was come unto, confessed before a great sight of people, and said that he might thank these four privy traitors before named of his sore fall, as who should say that those three bishops and the vicar of Croydon had committed no less treason than he had done. Now, good Lord for his Passion, who would have thought that these four holy men would have wrought in their lifetime such detestable treason?" And later on, speaking of the three abbots: "God caused, I say, not only their treason to be disclosed and come abroad in such a wonderful sort as never was heard of, which were too long to recite at this time, but also dead men's treason that long lay hidden under the ground; that is to say, the treason of the old bishop of Canterbury [Warham], the treason of the old bishop of St. Asaph

[Standish], the treason of the old vicar of Croydon, and the treason of the old bishop of London [Stokesley], which four traitors had concealed as much treason by their live's time as any of these traitors that were put to death. There was never a barrel better herring to choose [among] them all, as it right well appeared by the abbat of Reading's confession made at the day of [execution], who I daresay accused none of them for malice nor hatred. For the abbat as heartily loved those holy fathers as ever he loved any men in his life."

The abbot's "chief counsellor," John Eynon or Oynyon,* who had been particularly vehement in his protestations of innocence, also spoke, admitting his so-called treason, begging the prayers of the bystanders for his soul, and craving the king's forgiveness if in aught he had offended.† This over, the

* The usual spelling of this name has been Onyon or Oynyon, but it really was Eynon. It is so spelt in the document already referred to (Calendar, xi., No. 1,231), and also in the accurate entry of the conviction, to be found on the Controlment Roll, 31 Hen. VIII., m. 28 d. "Recordum attinctionis, &c., Hugonis abbatis monasterii de Redyng in dict. com. Berks. alias dicti Hugonis Cooke, nuper de Redyng in eodem com. Berks. clerici; Johannis Eynon nuper de Redyng in com. pred. clerici; Johannis Rugge nuper de Redyng in com. Berks. clerici alias dict. Johannis Rugge nuper de Redyng capellani pro quibusdam altis prodicionibus unde eorum quilibet p. se. indict. fuit. T. et S.

† Of John Eynon the hostile witness writes that he not only denied the charge of treason, "but also stoutly and stubbornly withstood it even to the utmost, evermore finding great fault with justice, and oftentimes casting his arms abroad, said: 'Alas. is this justice to destroy a man guiltless? I take it between God and my soul that I am as clear in this matter as the child that was this

sentence of hanging with its barbarous accessories was carried out upon abbot Cook and the two priests, John Eynon and John Rugg.*

The attainder of the abbot, according to the royal interpretation of the law, placed the abbey of Reading and its lands and possessions at Henry's dis-

night born.' Thus he prated and made a work as though he had not known what the matter had meant, thinking to have faced it out with a card of ten. And in this sort he held on even from the time of the arraignment till he came to the gallows. Marry then, when he saw none other way but one, his heart began somewhat to relent. Then both he and his companions, with their ropes about their necks, confessed before all the people that were present that they had committed high treason against the king's most noble person, but namely Oynon, for he said that he had offended the king's grace in such sort of treason that it was not expedient to tell thereof. Wherefore he besought the people not only to pray unto God for him, but also desired them, or some of them at the least, to desire the king's grace of his merciful goodness to forgive it his soul, for else he was sure, as he said, to be damned. And yet not an hour before a man that had heard him speak would have thought verily that he had been guiltless of treason."

* Eynon was, as before stated, a priest attached to the church of St. Giles, Reading. John Rugg had formerly held a prebend at Chichester, but had apparently retired to Reading. In December, 1531 (Calendar, v.), Rugg writes for his books to be sent to Reading from Chichester. Another letter, dated Feb. 3, 1532, from "your abbey-lover Jo. Rugg" shows that the writer had obtained dispensation for non-residence at Chichester. Coates ("Reading," p. 261), on the authority of Croke, says that John Rugg was indicted for saying "the king's highness cannot be Supreme Head of the Church of England." On being asked "what did you for saving your conscience when you were sworn to take the king for Supreme Head?" Rugg replied, "I added this condition in my mind, to take him for Supreme Head in temporal things, but not in spiritual things."

posal. In fact, as in the case of Glastonbury, on the removal of the abbot to the Tower in September, 1539, before either trial or condemnation, the pillage of the abbey had been commenced. As early as September 8th Thomas Moyle wrote from Reading that he, "master Vachell and Mr. Dean of York" (Layton) had "been through the inventory of the plate, etc., at the residence" there. "In the house," he said, "there is a chamber hanged with three pieces of metely good tapestry. It will serve well for hanging a mean little chamber in the king's majesty's house." This is all they think worth keeping for the royal use. "There is also," the writer adds, "a chamber hung with six pieces of verdure with fountains, but it is old and at the ends of some of them very foul and greasy." He notes several beds with silk hangings, and in the church eight pieces of tapestry, "very goodly" but small, and concludes by saying that he and his fellows think that the sum of £200 a year "will serve for pensions for the monks."^{*}

On September 15th another commissioner, Richard Pollard, wrote from Reading that he had dispatched certain goods according to Crumwell's direction "and part of the stuff reserved for the king's majesty's use." "The whole house and church" are, he says,

* R. O. Crum. Corr., xxix., No. 76. In the "Corporation diary," quoted in Coates' "Reading," p. 261, is the entry "before which said nineteenth of September (1539), the monastery is suppressed and the abbot is deprived, and after this suppression all things remain in the king's hands."

still "undefaced," and "as for the plate,* vestments, copes and hangings, which we have reserved also to the use of the king's majesty," they are left in good custody and are to be conveyed to London. "Thanks be to God," he adds, "everything is well finished and every man well contented and giveth humble thanks to the king's grace." †

The abbot of St. John's, Colchester, Thomas Marshall, ‡ writes Browne Willis, "was one of the

* In Pollard's account of the plate of "attainted persons and places" (*Monastic Treasures*, Abbotsford Club, p. 38) Reading is credited with 19½ ozs. of gold, 377 ozs. of gilt plate and 2,660 of silver. It is also stated that the abbot put "to gage to Sir W. Luke three gilt bowls of 152 ozs. and six silver bowls of 246 ozs."

† Wright, 220. Mr. Wright thinks this letter "must refer to the priory and not to the abbey." A letter from William Penison, to whom Pollard says he committed the charge "by indenture," says that on September 11th he "received possession of Mr. Pollard and other commissioners here (Reading, September 21) of the abbey of Reading and all the domains which the late abbot had in his hands at his late going away" (*R. O. Crum. Corr.*, Vol. xxxii., No. 36). This leaves no doubt that the letter printed by Wright refers to the *abbey*, and that the property was seized early in September. According apparently to Penison's information, abbot Cook was "late" abbot—in other words, had ceased to hold the office when he was taken to the Tower for the so-called examination. Penison, it may be added, made Crumwell a rich present to obtain the office of receiver, and had informed him that abbot Cook was getting rid of the monastic property (see Vol. i., p. 415).

‡ It has already been pointed out that Thomas Marshall was also called Beche. See Vol. i., p. 398. It may be worth while here, as some confusion has existed as to the last abbot of Colchester, to give the evidence of the Controlment Roll, 31 Hen. VIII., m. 36d., which leaves no room to doubt that Beche and Marshall are *aliases* for the same individual. "Recordum attinccionis Thomæ Beche nuper de West Donylands, in com. Essex, clerici, alias dicti Thomæ

three mitred parliamentary abbots . . . that had courage enough to maintain his conscience and run the last extremity, being neither to be prevailed upon by bribery, terror or any dishonourable motives to come into a surrender, or subscribe to the king's supremacy; on which account, being attainted of high treason, he suffered death."

Thomas Marshall succeeded abbot Barton in June, 1533, and entered upon the cares of office at a time when religious life was becoming almost impossible. At the outset he had apparently considerable difficulty in obtaining possession of the temporalities of his abbey. "I with the whole consent of my brethren," he writes to Crumwell, "have sealed four several obligations for the payment of £200 to the king's use . . . trusting now by your especial favour to have restitution of my temporalities with all other things pertaining to the same. . . . Unless I have your especial favour and aid in recovering such rents and dues as are withdrawn from the monastery of late, and I not able to recover them by the law, I cannot tell how I shall live in the world, saving my truth and promises."*

Marshall nuper de eisdem villa et comit., clerici, alias Thomæ Beche nuper abbatis nuper monasterii S. Johannis Bapt. juxta Colcestr., in com. pred. jam dissolut, alias dicti Thomæ Marshall nuper abb. nuper mon. S. Johis. Colcestr. in com. pred. pro quibusdam altis proditionibus." West Donylands was a manor belonging to the abbot, and the name occurs in exchanges made by the abbot with chancellor Audley in 1536 (see Calendar, xi., Nos. 385, 519).

* R. O. Crum Corr., vi., f. 145. The temporalities were restored on Jan. 23, 1534, and on March 30th of this same year the

Of the earlier career of Thomas Marshall little is known except that he, like the majority of his order in England, who were selected by their superiors for a university course, was sent to Oxford, where he resided for several years, and passed through the schools with credit to himself and his order. During this period he was probably an inmate of St. Benedict's or Gloucester Hall, the largest of the three establishments which the Benedictines possessed in Oxford, and to which the younger religious of most of the English abbeys were sent to pursue their higher studies.*

Very shortly after abbot Marshall's election his troubles commenced. At Colchester, as elsewhere in the country at this period, there were to be found some only too anxious to win favour to themselves by carrying reports of the doings and sayings of new abbot took his seat in the House of Lords. It has been thought that Marshall is the same Thomas Marshall who ruled the abbey of Chester until 1530, and is counted as the 26th abbot of that house ("Monasticon," iv., Browne Willis, etc.). Whether, on his retirement from Chester in favour of the reinstated abbot, John Birchenshaw, he went to Colchester is uncertain. If he had been long at this latter monastery it is somewhat strange that the witnesses against him in 1539 should have professed to be unacquainted with him until his election.

* St. Benedict's is now represented by Worcester College; Canterbury Hall, destined for the monks of the metropolitan church, is now merged in Christ Church; and Trinity College has succeeded to St. Cuthbert's Hall, the learned home of the monks of Durham. D. Thomas Marshall, O.S.B., supplicated for B.D. January 24, 1508; disputed 3rd June, 1511; admitted to oppose 19th Oct.; received the degree of S.T.B. 10th Dec.; sued for D.D. and disputed 20th April, 1515. Boase, "Register of the University of Oxford," p. 63.

their brethren to Crumwell or the king. In April, 1534, a monk of St. John's complained of the "slandrous and presumptuous" sayings of the subprior, "D. John Francis." This latter monk, according to Crumwell's informer, had "declared our sovereign lord the king and his most honourable council, on the occasion of a new book of articles, to be all heretics, whereas before he said they were but schismatics."* These and other remarks were quite sufficient to have brought both the bold monk himself and his abbot into trouble at a time when the gossip of the fraternity or shaving-house was picked up by eavesdroppers and carried to court to regale the ears of the lord Privy Seal. In this case, however, the report came on the eve of the administration to the monks of Colchester of what was to be henceforth considered the touchstone of loyalty, the oath of supremacy. On the 7th of July, 1534, the oath was offered to the monks in the chapter house of St. John's, and taken by abbot Marshall and sixteen monks, including dom John Francis, the subprior complained of to Crumwell.

Very little indeed is known about Colchester or the doings of the abbot from this time till his arrest in 1539. At the time of the northern rising, whilst the commissioners for gaol delivery sat at Colchester, they were invited to dine at the abbey with the abbot of St. John's. When they were at dinner, as Crumwell's informant writes to him, one Marmaduke

* Calendar, 1534, Ap. viii.

Nevell and others came into the hall. I asked him, says the writer, "How do the traitors in the north?" "No traitors, for if ye call us traitors we will call you heretics." Nevell then went on to say that the king had pardoned them, or they had not been at Colchester. They were, he declared, 30,000 well-horsed, and "I am sure," he said, "my lord abbot will make me good cheer;" and asked why, said, "Marry, for all the abbeys in England be beholden to us, for we have set up all the abbeys again in our country, and though it were never so late they sang mattins the same night." He added that in the north they were "plain fellows," and southern men, though they "thought as much, durst not utter it."*

Another glimpse of the life led by the abbot of Colchester during the few troubled years of his authority is afforded by a writer of a slightly subsequent period:—

"Those who can call to mind the cruel deeds of Henry VIII., the confusion of things sacred and profane, and the slaughterings of which he was the author, will have no difficulty in recollecting the case of John Beache, abbat of Colchester. Excelling many of the abbats of his day in devotion, piety, and learning, the sad fate of the cardinal (Fisher) and the execution of Sir Thomas More oppressed him with grief and bitterness. For he had greatly loved them; and as he had honoured them when living, so now that they had so gladly suffered death for the Church's unity, he began to reverence and venerate them, and often and much did he utter to that effect, and made his friends partakers of his grief which the late events had caused him. And he was in

* Calendar, xi., 1319.

the habit of extolling the piety, meekness, and innocence of the late martyrs to those guests whom he invited to his table, and who came to him of their own will, some of whom assented to his words, while others listened in silence. There came at length a traitorous guest, a violator of the sacred rights of hospitality, who by his words incited the abbat to talk about the execution of the cardinal and More, hoping to entrap him in his speech. Thereon the abbat, who could not be silent on such a theme, spoke, indeed, in their praise, but with moderation and sparingly, adding, at last, that he marvelled what cause of complaint the king could have found in men so virtuous and learned, and the greatest ornaments of Church and State, as to deem them unworthy of longer life, and to condemn them to a most cruel death. These words did this false friend carry away in his traitorous breast, to make them known in due season to the advisers of the king. What need of more? The abbat is led to the same tribunal which had condemned both Fisher and More, and there received the like sentence of death; yea, his punishment was the more cruel than theirs, for in his case no part of the sentence was remitted. Thus he was added as the third to the company of the two former. But why should I call him the third, and try to enumerate the English martyrs of that time, who are past counting? The writers of our annals mention many by name, but there were many more whose names they could not ascertain, whose number is known to God alone, for whose cause they died. Yet I hope that some day God will make known their names and the resting-places of their bodies, which were in life the dwelling places of His Holy Spirit.”*

About the time of the arrest of the abbots of Reading and Glastonbury, in September, 1539,

* Life of Fisher in B. Mus. Arundel MS., 152, f. 235 d. This valuable collection for the lives of Fisher and More comprises contemporary and sub-contemporary documents of undoubted authenticity and importance.

reports were spread as to the approaching dissolution of St. John's, Colchester. Sir Thomas Audley, the chancellor, endeavoured to avert what he thought would be an evil thing for the county. He had heard the rumours about the destruction of the two abbeys of St. John's, Colchester, and St. Osyth's, and, writing to Crumwell, he begs they may continue, "not, as they be, religious; but that the king's majesty of his goodness to translate them into colleges. . . . For the which, as I said to you before, his grace may have of either of them £1,000, that is for both £2,000, and the gift of the deans and prebendaries at his own pleasure. The cause I move this is, first, I consider that St. John's standeth in his grace's own town at Colchester, wherein dwell many poor people, who have daily relief of the house. Another cause, both these houses be in the end of the shire of Essex, where little hospitality will be kept if these be dissolved. For as for St. John's it lacketh water, and Saint Osith's standeth in the marshes, not very wholesome, so that few of reputation, as I think, will keep continual houses in any of them unless it be a congregation as there is now. There are also twenty houses, great and small, dissolved in the shire of Essex already." Audley then goes on to protest that he only asks for the common good, and can get no advantage himself by the houses being allowed to continue, and concludes by offering Crumwell £200 for himself if he can persuade the king to grant his request.*

* Wright, p. 246.

The circumstances attending abbot Marshall's arrest are unknown, but by the beginning of November, 1539, he was in the Tower. On the 1st of that month Edmund Crowman, who had been his servant ever since he had been abbot, was under examination. All that was apparently extracted from this witness was that a year before the abbot had given him certain plate to take care of and "£40 in a coser."*

The abbot's chaplain was also interrogated as to any words he had heard the abbot speak against the king at any time, but little information was elicited from him. The most important piece of evidence is a document, which, as it contains declarations as to abbot Marshall's opinions upon several important matters, and as it is almost the only record of the examinations of witnesses against any of the three abbots, may here be given as nearly as possible in the original form.

Interrogatories ministered unto Robert Rowse, mercer, of Colchester, 4^{to} Novembris anno regni Henrici octavi tricesimo primo (1539). Ad primam, the said Rowse sworne upon the Evangel, and sayeth that he hath known the abbat of Colchester the space of six years at midsummer last past or thereabout, about which time the said — was elected abbat.†

* R. O. Crum. Corr., xxxviii., No. 42. In a curious list, giving apparently the dates of the supposed acts of treason committed by various people, is the entry: "Thos. Marshall abbas de Colchester. 17 die Septembris anno. 30^o" (1538). The date of abbot Whiting's treason is given as "4th August a^o 27^o" (1535); and abbot Cook's as "1 March anno. 27^o" (1536). See R. O. Exch. Augt. Off. Misc. Bk., 313 *b.*, f. 8.

† D. Thomas Marshall or Beche was elected June 10, 1533.

And within a sennight after or thereabout this examinant sent unto the said abbat a dish of bass (baces) and a pottle of wine to the welcome. Upon the which present the said abbat did send for the examinant to dine with him upon a Friday, at which time they were first acquainted, and since was divers times in his company and familiar with him unto a fortnight before the feast of All Hallows was two years past.—ROBERT ROWSE.

2. Ad secundam, he sayeth that the principal cause why that he did leave the company of the said abbat was because that abbat was divers times communing and respuing against the king's majesty's supremacy and such ordinances as were passed by the act of Parliament concerning the extinguishment of the bishop of Rome's usurped authority, saying that the whole authority was given by Christ unto Peter and to his successors, bishops of Rome, to bind and to loose, and to grant pardons for sin, and to be chief and supreme head of the Church throughout all Christian realms immediate and next unto Christ, and that it was against God's commandment and His laws that any temporal prince should be head of the Church. And also he said that the king's highness had evil counsel that moved him to take on hand to be chief head of the Church of England and to pull down these houses of religion which were founded by his grace's progenitors and many noble men for the service and honour of God, the commonwealth, and relief of poor folk, and that the same was both against God's law and man's law; and, furthermore, he said that by means of the premises (?) the king and his council were drawn into such an inordinate covetousness that if all the water in the Thames were flowing gold and silver it were not able to slake their covetousness, and said a vengeance of all such councillors.—
ROBERT ROWSE.

Supremacy.

The whole authority committed to Peter.

Against the supremacy.

Against man's law and God's law.

Covetous.

A vengeance.

3. Ad tertiam, he sayeth that he is not well remembered

of the year nor of the days that the said abbat had the fore-said communications because he spoke at divers times, and specially at such times as he heard that any such matters were had in use, and furthermore of this he is well remembered of that at such time as the monks of Sion, the bishop of Rochester, and Sir Thomas More were put to execution, the said abbat would say that he marvelled greatly of such tyranny as was used by the king and his council Tyranny. to put such holy men to death, and further the abbat said that in his opinion they died holy martyrs and in the Died martyrs. right of Christ's Church.—ROBERT ROWSE.

4. Ad quartam, he sayeth that the last time that ever he heard the said abbat have any communication of such matters was immediately after that he heard of the insurrection in the north parts he sent for this examinant to come to sup with him, and in the mean time that supper was making ready the abbat and the examinant were walking between the hall and the garden in a little gallery off the ground, and then and there the abbat axed of this examinant what news he heard of the coast? and this examinant said that he heard none. Then the abbat said: "Dost you not hear of the insurrection in the North?" and this examinant said "no." Northern
 "The northern lads be up and they begin to take men.
 pip in the webe (*sic*) and say plainly that they will have no more abbeys suppressed in their country;" and he said to this examinant that the northern men were as true subjects unto the king as anywhere within his realm, and that they desired nothing of the king but that they might have delivered unto their hands the archbishop of Canterbury, the lord chancellor, and the lord privy seal; and the abbat said "would to God that the northern men had them, for then (he said) we should have a merry world, for they were three arch-heretics," Arch-heretics.
 which term this examinant never heard before; and so then they went to supper, and since this time which was as this examinant doth remember a fortnight or three

weeks before the feast of All Saints was two years.—ROBERT ROWSE.*

The evidence of Thomas Nuthake, a "physition," of Colchester, is to the like effect. He had not, he said, to his knowledge seen or known abbot Thomas before his election, although he had divers times repaired to the abbey before that time. In reply to the third question, this doctor "sayeth that concerning the marriage of queen Anne this examinant remembers he hath heard the said abbat say that the reason why the king's highness did forsake the bishop of Rome was to the intent that his majesty might be divorced from the lady dowager and wed queen Anne, and therefore his grace refused to take the bishop of Rome for the supreme head of the Church, and made himself the supreme head."†

Another of the witnesses against the lord abbot of Colchester was a cleric, John Seyn, who deposed that when he had informed him of his neighbour, the abbot of St. Osyth's, surrender of his monastery to the king, answered, "I will not say the king shall never have *my* house, but it will be against my will and against my heart, for I know by my learning that he cannot take it by right and law, wherefore in my conscience I cannot be content, nor he shall never have it with my heart and will." Whereunto John Seyn, clerk, answered in this wise: "Beware

* R. O. State Papers, Dom., 1539, 204. The marginal notes, copied from the original document, indicate the chief points on which the examination turned.

† *Ibid.*, 204.

of such learning as ye learned at Oxenford when ye were young. Ye would be hanged and ye are worthy. I will advise you to conform yourself as a true subject, or else you shall hinder your brethren and also yourself."*

Nothing more is known of abbot Marshall's last days but the fact of his execution on December 1st, 1539. The story of his sudden arrest and instant execution, as told by the Colchester historian, looks improbable.† Even if true, the abbot's journey to London, his examinations, his imprisonment in the Tower, ‡ and the various measures taken with his servants§ must have quite prepared him for the fate awaiting those who resisted the will of Henry.||

* R. O. Crum. Corr., xxxviii., No. 41.

† "Monasticon," iv., 605. "Morant says there was a tradition in his time in the town of Colchester that the magistrates invited abbot Beche to a feast and then showed him the warrant, and went and hanged him without further warrant or ceremony."

‡ His name appears in the list of prisoners B. Mus. Cott. MS. Tit., B. i., f. 133.

§ R. O. State Papers, 1539, $\frac{v}{30}$, is "an account of money paid by Dr. Belassis unto the late servants of the abbat of St. John's besides Colchester, as well for their charges and horsemeat, since they came to London, as for the arrearages of their wages and the king's majesty's reward bestowed upon them."

|| The enamelled pectoral cross of the venerable John Beche has been preserved, and is now in possession of the Hon. and Right rev. William Clifford, D.D., bishop of Clifton. On one side it bears in the centre the Sacred Heart of our Lord, surrounded by the crown of thorns, above which is the inscription, "I.N.R.I.," and below it the sacred monogram, "I.H.S." The wounded hands and feet of our Saviour are represented on the same side; on the back the

As in the case of Glastonbury and Reading, the abbot's imprisonment was the signal for commencing the pillage of church and monastery. By November 19th, 1539, the plate, consisting of 15 ounces of gold, 672 of silver gilt, and 1557 ounces of parcel gilt or silver had been sent by the king's receivers into the royal treasury, together with a couple of mitres and "a crozier staff" of gilt plate and iron.* Within six weeks of the execution of the abbot the monastic buildings of St. John's, with the abbey church, which had been consecrated nearly 450 years before, were dismantled. It took four men under the charge of one who designates himself "Francis Jobson, gentleman," eight days to strip the lead from the roof and melt it into pigs. The account of the expenses incurred in the process proves that they lived on the fat of the land whilst engaged on the work of desolation. At the end of the week the broken bell metal was packed in barrels and carted away to be sold.†

The property was granted to Thomas, lord Darcy, whose family became extinct in the fourth generation. In the first two centuries no fewer than nine

instruments of the Passion are depicted. The following inscriptions appear in and about the cross and its covering: "Qui vult post me venire abneget semetipsum et tollat crucem suam et sequatur me." "En homo quæ pro te patetur (*sic*) tormenta Redemptor." "Hoc signum crucis erit in celo cum Dñs ad judicandum venerit." "Passio Dni nostri Jesu Christi eruat nos a dolore tristi."

* Monastic Treasures, Abbotsford Club, p. 27.

† R. O. Exch. Q. R. Suppression Papers, $\frac{832}{24}$.

families and fifteen individuals had by birth or purchase become the possessors of the abbey spoils. History does not relate what became of the "many poor people" who dwelt "at Colchester," of whom chancellor Audley wrote that they "had daily relief of the house."

It is necessary to revert once more to the singular mystery which surrounds the fate of these abbots. Suddenly the *Baga de secretis*, which affords information as to earlier "treasons," fails. In vain has search been made through books, rolls of legal proceedings and detached papers of the date of their execution and subsequent years. The records in the country do not begin at such an early date, and saving the possibility of further revelations from the archives at Woburn, this chapter contains all that can be found on the subject. From these gleanings, which have been given almost at length, the reader may form his own conclusion.

CHAPTER X.

THE MONASTIC SPOILS.

IT is by no means easy to determine with anything like accuracy the value of the property which passed into the royal possession by Henry's ecclesiastical depredations. The annual revenue of the various houses, including lands and the proceeds from the spiritual benefices held by them, is reckoned by Speed at £171,312 4s. 3¼d. Other valuations place it at a somewhat higher figure, so that a modern calculation of £200,000, in round numbers, as the annual receipts of the confiscated property does not appear to be excessive.* Hence the fall of the monasteries transferred an income of more than two million pounds sterling a year of the present money from the Church and poor to the royal purse.

It is well, however, to state at once that Henry did not derive by any means so large a benefit from his policy of spoliation. What with gratuitous grants, sales of lands and other means whereby the capital value of the prize was diminished, the annual income actually received by the royal treasury was at no time anything approaching the sum at which the revenue of the monastic houses was computed. In fact, the entire sum paid by the royal receivers

* Blunt, "The Reformation," p. 369.

into the Court of Augmentation as representing the revenue derived from the confiscated estates was only £415,005 6s. 10½d. for the eleven years between Michaelmas, 1536, and the same date in 1547. That is, an average yearly income of only £37,000 was, during the last years of Henry's life, secured to him by the seizure of Church property producing at least five times that annual revenue. Further, in no single year did the income exceed £45,000, although for five years, from 1539 to 1544, the average approached that sum. In other words, the king actually obtained by his confiscations an average yearly revenue only slightly exceeding the estimated income of the smaller houses.*

During this period, however, the crown obtained a large sum by the sale of the monastic lands, ecclesiastical benefices and other property from which the religious houses derived their income.

* The figures are taken from the accounts of the treasurer of the Court of Augmentation (R. O. Aug. Off. Treas. Rolls, i. to. iv.) For a balance sheet of these accounts see the appendix of this volume. As the yearly receipts from the confiscated lands may be of interest they are here given :—

	£	s.	d.
From April 24th, 1536, to September 29th, 1538, including certain receipts for goods sold which cannot be ascertained and deducted	27,732	2	9½
From 1538 to 1539	24,223	7	2½
From 1539 to 1543	177,806	7	3½
From 1543 to 1544	44,945	2	11½
From 1544 to 1547	140,298	6	6½
Total for 11 years	£415,005	6	10½

The papers of the period contain ample evidence of the eagerness with which the hungry courtiers sought to profit by the destruction of the time-honoured monastic corporations. Much, no doubt, was parted with unwillingly. But it was necessary to make the strong ones of the nation sharers of the plunder that, thus committed to the policy, they might resist any future cry for restitution. Other lands were quickly exchanged with noble landowners for the same purpose, and much was sold to lords, merchant venturers and speculators at good prices. "Thus," says an old writer, "was the Church pared and pruned and made a prey, every bird being desirous to beautify herself with her fair feathers."

A veritable scramble followed the dissolution, and a vast amount of land changed hands very rapidly. Many obtained grants or purchased the Church property only to exchange or sell it again at an advantage to themselves. Some special supporters of Henry's policy secured large shares for themselves and their families through their own or Crumwell's influence. Thus, to take but one or two examples, lord Audley obtained as his part the possessions of more than nine religious foundations; Edward lord Clinton had twelve, including the rich lands of the Benedictine abbey of Barking; the duke of Northumberland became master of eighteen, while Suffolk was the spoiler of no less than thirty monastic properties. The net result to the royal exchequer of Henry's traffic in these Church lands was only

£855,751 18s. 5d.* This sum, equivalent to more than eight and a half millions sterling of the present money, although large in itself, can by no means represent the real value of the property disposed of by the king. There are certain indications that for some of the lands fair prices, equal to twenty years' purchase of the rents, were given to the king. Thus Sir Richard Gresham, father of the more celebrated Sir Thomas, wrote to Cromwell, "to be advertised" that he had "moved the king's majesty to purchase of his grace certain lands belonging to the house of Fountains, to the value of £350 by year, after the rate of twenty years' purchase. The sum of money," he adds, "amounteth to £7,000."† This amount apparently he subsequently paid as he is credited with £11,137 11s. 8d. in discharge of what was owing for the lands of Fountains, together with those of the two Benedictine nunneries of Swine and Nunkeling.‡

* See Appendix. The largest sales of lands took place in the year from Michaelmas, 1544, to Michaelmas, 1545, when the sum of £164,495 1s. 5d. was realized. The sales include certain lands of attainted persons, such as the countess of Salisbury, Sir Stephen Hammerton, etc. In this year John Ap Rice bought the priory of St. Guthlac's, Hereford, for £1,570 1s. 9d. (R. O. Exch. Aug. Off. Treas. Rolls, ii., mm. 8d. to 28d.).

† Ellis, "Orig. Letters," iii., Ser. iii., 270. On this basis Blunt (p. 371) calculates the capital value of the income which came into the king's hands at £48,000,000. For a very considerable proportion, however, as the actual figures prove, Henry really only obtained about a sixth part of that sum.

‡ R. O. Exch. Aug. Off. Treas. Roll., ii., m. 100d. Whether the sum was actually paid in cash seems somewhat doubtful. The

Other purchasers, however, must certainly have obtained their portions at very much lower rates. Thus Crumwell's nephew, Richard Williams, apparently paid under £5,000 for Ramsey abbey, which was sold to him on March 4th, 1540, while the income of the monastery was returned at more than £1,700 a year. Lord Crumwell himself, to take but one more instance, paid but £1,446 10s. for Launde priory with its revenue of £400 a year.* But even with the easy terms upon which much of monastic lands was granted the royal agents experienced considerable difficulty in obtaining the promised payments. No less a sum was due to the crown on this account than £76,141 8s. 3d. when Henry died.

It would be impossible within the limits of an ordinary book to follow in detail the dispersion of the Church lands among the band of royal retainers, who all hungered and clamoured for a share in the booty. Little by little the broad acres and ecclesiastical benefices, upon the revenues of which not only had the monks and nuns subsisted, but which had served to support the poor, aged and sick of the country, and for other public and national purposes, passed away into private hands without having contributed any substantial advantage to the country or crown, and unburdened by any condition king had large transactions with Gresham. At one time he owed him for silks nearly £800, and a note in the accounts makes it appear probable that this and other debts were set off against Fountains abbey.

* *Ibid.*, m. 11.

of service to the commonwealth or particular district, which had hitherto characterized its tenure. Compared with the revenue derived by the religious establishments from their endowments and with the capital value of their property as estimated from that income, the net result of the destruction of the monasteries, so far as the nation at large went, from a financial point of view was cruelly disappointing. For a brief period the royal revenue was augmented; but the income derived by the king from confiscated lands at no time approached what the same estates produced under the thrifty management of their monastic owners. The sale of the acres obtained for the royal purse a large sum of money, but even this was small when compared with their intrinsic worth, or with what their real value was to the nation at large.

Those who reaped advantage from the work of desolation, from the overthrow of so many architectural monuments and destruction of almost countless works of art, from the seizure of lands bestowed upon the monks for purposes ecclesiastical and patriotic, were the "new men." To them good came from the hardships and misery inflicted upon hundreds of religious men and women and their retainers. They mounted into power and place upon the ruins of the old monastic houses and laid the foundation of their family fortunes upon wealth filched in the name of the law from the patrimony of the poor.

From the consideration of the value of the

monastic lands, which thus came into the royal possession, it is necessary to turn to the work of the royal agents in effecting the transfer of the estates and other property from the religious to the king. The story of the dismantling and destruction of so many sanctuaries and houses of religion in every part of the kingdom presents many points of pathetic interest. Some of these have been touched upon in previous chapters, and the present pages must be occupied principally with cold calculations about pecuniary results.

The method adopted by Henry to realize the moveables and other saleable effects of the monasteries was apparently the same in every case. In each of eleven monasteries included in one commission, a distinct jury was impanelled to witness the valuation, and a retinue of "strangers" from London travelled with the commissioner.* The costs of these men engaged upon the work were considerable, and include such items as "minstrels 4d." and in the evening "wine and sugar 2s." It is pleasing to find in the accounts indications that the people of a neighbourhood were not too ready to assist in the work of demolition. In the above account twenty pence had to be paid for "a guide from Repton to Gracediew," while the demand for help in the case of the destruction of the church at Lewes, previously noticed, would seem to show that it was at any rate

* R. O. Exch. Augt. Off. Misc. Bk., 172. Printed by Mackenzie E. Walcott, "Archæologia," Vol. xliii., pp. 201-249.

sometimes necessary to bring hardened ruffians from London to accomplish such work.*

As was almost inevitable in a work of this nature, the king by no means received the full values of things sold or seized. From Crumwell downwards the officials appear to have well looked after their own interests † at this time. To adopt the expression used by Dr. London, whilst engaged in the work of gathering up the plate and jewels and expelling monks and nuns, it was, indeed, "a pretty bank," ‡ not only to the king, but to all lucky enough to be employed in such a service. Even such a man as Rich, the chancellor of the Court of Augmentation, was not free from suspicion. An early writer states that had Henry lived a day or two longer he would have punished this minister.§ And there is documentary evidence to prove that the king charged his official with allowing him to be cheated out of £570 a year in the exchanges of land made with the

* Stow relates ("Survey," p. 58) that "the church and steeple" of the priory of H. Trinity, in the ward of Aldgate, "were proffered to whomsoever would take it down and carry it from the ground, but no man would undertake the offer." Stukeley, speaking of Glastonbury ("Itinerarium Curiosum," ed. 1776, Iter. vi.) says, "I observed frequent instances of the townsmen being generally afraid to make such purchases (of stone from the ruins) as thinking an unlucky fate attends the family where these materials are used, and they told me many stories and particular instances of it."

† For an indication of Crumwell's share in this general scramble see Vol. i., pp. 420-431.

‡ Wright, p. 235.

§ B. Mus. Arund. MS., 152, in the contemporary collections for the lives of Fisher and More.

duke of Suffolk, as well as having received money for the sales of lands and lead without accounting for it.*

Sir Ralph Sadler, to give but another instance, was gravely compromised in the same way. "At his first coming from Scotland of the insurrection of Yorkshire," runs the record of a subsequent examination, one Oswald Sisson, "perceiving then that many abbeys in Yorkshire would be surrendered, willed and procured the said Sir Ralph to ask of the king's majesty the preferment of the monastery of Selby . . . before the surrender thereof and promised to give to the said Sir Ralph Sadler for a fine for a lease of 21 years £100 in money and a horse, which he afterwards did." Sadler took the money and horse and granted the lease before the surrender of the monastery and before obtaining the grant from the king. Subsequently, when he had got the monastery from Henry, he offered it to Sisson at a profit of £110 more than he had agreed to pay. Sisson paid the money, and in his turn went into Yorkshire, where he "marked certain woods," intending to pay Sadler with the proceeds and to make more by the granting of other leases. Falling ill, he sold the lands of Selby to the royal receiver of the district, Leonard Beckwith, for £1,240.† "By the frauds of the officials of the

* R. O. Exch. Q. R. Ancient Misc., 7²/₃.

† R. O. Exch. Augt. Off. Misc. Bk., 113, No. 31. In two other documents (Nos. 86 and 99) of the same volume a series of charges are laid against this Leonard Beckwith. He had sold lead

Court of Augmentation to whom was committed the gathering in of the great spoils," writes a contemporary, "the king was robbed. This much is certain, that a great number of men who when appointed to the office were possessed only of inkhorn and pen were after two years able to rank in wealth and estates with 'the highest in the land.'"*

What was done in the case of lands and false surveys was more easily accomplished with regard to the plate and other precious moveables of the dissolved monasteries. An interesting example of the private purses made by the commissioners is afforded in the case of Thomas Bedyll.† He died apparently early in September, 1537, and thus before he had such opportunities of obtaining plunder as others had. Still, he had apparently not neglected and other things to his relations at less than their value. He had returned a false survey of the woods at Selby, making them less than half their real extent. Before the dissolution of monasteries he had endeavoured to get annuities from them, promising "if the houses did stand that he would not take so much as they did grant." In this way he procured no less than 23 patents for the religious, all dated in 1538 or 1539. These and other charges were examined into, and many were acknowledged by Beckwith himself.

* B. Mus. Arund. MS., 151, f. 386 (written about 1557).

† An account of Bedyll is to be found in Wood's "Athenæ," Vol. ii. He was one of those appointed to examine the "Holy maid of Kent," and employed to get the Charterhouse monks to conform. As clerk of the council, he and Richard Layton examined blessed John Fisher. He was one of the commissioners for visiting religious houses previous to their dissolution. "This appointment," says Ellis, "probably made lord Cromwell anxious to get possession of his papers and effects."

his chances; and Crumwell's nephew, Richard, who had been sent to seize what he could find, wrote: "Before my coming to Mr. Bedyll's house in Aldersgate Street, London, his woman had sent thither two of his servants . . . who had ransacked and conveyed this night, so that nothing but bedding, books and such other there remain." Having heard, however, that he was acquainted with Raynes,* "I came to the said John Raynes and declared to him that my coming was to see such money, plate and jewels as Mr. Bedyll had left in his custody. He forthwith confessed that he had a 'gardiviance' (ambry) of his and brought out the same to me wherein is such plate and gold as your lordship by a bill of particulars herein enclosed may perceive." It is now, the writer adds, in the custody of "Williamson at your place by friar Augustines."†

The plate of the doomed houses, principally, indeed, the chalices and other sacred vessels of the altar, were the first solicitude of the royal spoilers. It is impossible even to guess at the worth of this portion of the king's booty. During centuries of undisturbed possession the monasteries of England

* John Raynes was a well-known bookseller of the day in St. Paul's Churchyard.

† Ellis, "Orig. Letters," iii., Ser. iii., p. 104. Speaking of Sir Thomas Pope, his biographer writes: "His prodigious property was accumulated in consequence of the destruction of the religious houses, and the lucky opportunity of raising an estate from this grand harvest of riches which now lay open before him seems to have diverted his thoughts from making a fortune by law." Wharton, "Life of Pope" (ed. 1780), p. 23.

must have been enriched by what would to-day be accounted priceless works of art in silver and gold. To the agents of Henry they represented merely so many ounces of metal, and as such only is there any record whatever of the precious contents of the monastic treasure-houses. What these must have been may be gathered from an extract from an account of England, written about the year 1500, by an Italian. "Above all," says the writer, "their (the English) riches are displayed in the Church treasures; for there is not a parish church in the kingdom so mean as not to possess crucifixes, candlesticks, censers, patens and cups of silver. Nor is there a convent of mendicant friars so poor, as not to have all these same articles in silver besides many other ornaments worthy of a Cathedral church in the same metal. Your magnificence may therefore imagine what the decorations of those enormously rich Benedictine, Carthusian, and Cistercian monasteries must be."*

Only in very few instances do the spoilers add to the record of weight any detail of the precious work, frequently enriched with jewels, or enamelled bosses, or richly chased and beaten into artistic form by the hammer of the cunning smith, before it is swept into the bag of plunder to be "dispoiled" at the mint, and ultimately to find its way into the royal melting-pot, from which it issued forth as the debased money

* Camden Soc., "Italian (probably Venetian) relation about England, 1500," p. 29.

by which Henry cheated his subjects in his later years. Thus, to take one or two examples, from Westminster the record notes specially "a cup called the 'maser belle or saint Edward's maser,' " a "cross of beryl" and "a dish or basin of precious stone called agate, ornamented with gold, precious stones and pearls."* From Canterbury, too, there was taken "a crozier of silver ornamented, called Thomas Beckett's staff," besides the mass of gold and silver and precious stones. And in rare instances particular inventories have been preserved of the precious church ornaments and plate found at some monastery and carried off to the royal treasury.†

* R. O. Exch. Augt. Off. Treas. Roll, ii., m. 109d.

† As a specimen of the works of art ruthlessly destroyed, the description given (R. O. Exch. Q. R. Church Goods $\frac{1}{2}$) of "The shrine, called the Corpus Christi shrine, in York," may be given in detail. "First, the said shrine is all gilt having 6 images, gilt, with an image of the birth of Our Lord, of mother of pearl, silver and gilt, and 33 small images enamelled standing about the same. A tablet of gold, 2 gold rings, one with a saphire and the other with a pearl. Eight other little images, and a great tablet of gold having in it the image of Our Lady, of mother of pearl. This shrine is, in length three quarters of a yard and a nail, in breadth a quarter of a yard and more, and in height half a yard and over, besides the steeple standing upon the same. The same shrine besides the steeple (is esteemed) to be worth £120 and above. The said steeple, having a weather-cock thereupon all gilt, a ryall of gold, 4 old nobles; 2 gilt groats, all hanging on the steeple. Also (there is) within the same steeple a beryl, wherein the Sacrament is borne, having in the said beryl two images of angels in silver gilt, bearing up the said sacrament. The foot and covering of which said beryl is silver gilt weighing together with the gold and beryl besides the said shrine 181 ounces, which at 3s. 4d. the ounce (is) worth £40 14s. 6d. A silver bell hanging in the said steeple weighing

Even before the actual dissolution the king had relieved the monastic superiors of the charge of a considerable portion of their plate. The cathedral churches also at the same time were examined, and the best part of their gold and silver ornaments found their way into the king's hands. A very large amount of spoil, too, was obtained through the royal crusade against relics, and, without weighing Henry's motives, it would have been more easy to believe in his good intentions had he not enriched himself so considerably by his attack upon the honour shown to the tombs and remains of holy men. As the noble author of his life remarks, "Henry promoted no other reformation but only that which would turn the penny and increase the exchequer." And, whatever view may be taken as to the good or evil resulting to the Church by this

3½ ounces, at 3s. 4d. the ounce, 11s. 8d." Then follows a variety of ornaments with which a succession of pious donors had enriched this repository of the Most Blessed Sacrament. These comprise sets of beads, crucifixes, rings, stones and crystals priced at £30 6s. 6d. There were likewise articles of pure gold esteemed to be worth £10 os. 6d., the chief among which was "a heart of gold with a diamond," also "ten pair of coral beads," with silver gilt "gaudies," "two St. James shells in silver" and various other enrichments of silver and stones. The total value of this great "shrine" for the Blessed Sacrament is estimated by the royal officers at £210 18s. 2d., or more than £2,100 in the present value of money. What such a piece of goldsmith's work would be really worth at the present day may be judged from the few specimens treasured among the national art collections in the South Kensington Museum. The inventory is printed in "Archæologia," x., p. 469, and in the "Register" of the Guild. Surtees Soc., p. 296.

action, the dishonour shown to the remains of the saints by the royal agents must on all hands be condemned. Even if it be allowed that some of the venerated relics had little title in fact to be what they claimed, still by far the greater number had a history which alone should have shielded them from positive disrespect, whilst many of them were undoubtedly the mortal remains of men and women whose names were written in no less honour on the pages of English history than on the diptychs of the Church. They were, to adopt Mr. Froude's language, "the peculiar treasures of the great abbeys and cathedrals—the mortal remains of the holy men in whose memories they had been founded, who by martyr's deaths, or lives of superhuman loftiness, had earned the veneration of later ages. The bodies of the saints had been gathered into costly shrines which a beautiful piety had decorated with choicest offerings. In an age which believed, without doubt or pretence, that the body of a holy man was incorporated into the body of Christ, that the seeming dust . . . would form again the living home of the spirit which had gone away but for a while, such dust was looked upon with awe and pious fear."*

* A general discussion on the subject of relics would be out of place here. The reader is referred to a note in the Appendix on the subject of the great relic of the "Holy Blood of Hayles," about which so much has been said. For a defence of the monks and ecclesiastics against the charge of deceit, and an explanation of the care taken to guard against imposture by the original procurers of the relics of the Passion and the Apostles, see Dixon, "Hist.,"

Although no general seizure of the shrines of the saints was attempted by Henry till the year 1538, as early as May, 1537, the duke of Norfolk was directed to remove that of Bridlington. "As for the shrine," the letter runs, "the king's highness, to the intent that his people should not be seduced in the offering of their money, would have it taken down. This and all other jewels and plate appertaining to his highness, except such as you desire to have for your money" are to be despatched to London.*

About the middle of the year 1538 general orders were apparently despatched to the officers of various counties directing them to repair to the several churches within the limits of their jurisdiction and effect the demolition of every noted shrine. Under cover of a pretended zeal to attack the vice of superstition, they were directed to take away the "shrine and bones with all the ornaments of the said shrine belonging and all other relics, silver, gold and all jewels belonging to the said shrine, and . . . see them safely and surely conveyed unto our Tower of London." Further, they were ordered "to see that both the shrine and the place where it was kept be destroyed even to the ground."†

ii., p. 48, *et seq.* It is, however, hard to understand why the learned author should think that the possible existence of pieces of the Holy Cross and other such relics, which he designates as "the greatest and most sacred of them," is a thing which "exceeds all credibility."

* R. O. State Papers, Dom., 1537, $\frac{T}{12}$.

† The order for the destruction of the shrine of St. Richard of Chichester is given in Wilkins. The document, dated at Hampton

The circumstances attending the destruction of one or two of these precious monuments may be here recorded as examples. Pollard, one of the royal agents, in a letter to Crumwell describes the desecration of St. Swithun's, at Winchester. It was "about three o'clock in the morning," he writes, that "we made an end of the shrine here." The prior and convent "were very conformable," he says, and he was assisted in his work, which lasted on through the night, by "the mayor with eight or nine of his brethren, the bishop's chancellor, Mr. doctor Crawford with a good appearance of honest personages besides." The scene presented by that varied crowd who through the darkness of an autumn night watched from among the shadows of the venerable cathedral, whilst Pollard and his barbarous crew hacked and tore down the shrine which for centuries had been the glory of Winchester, may be easily pictured to the imagination. By the dim light of a candle the commissioner, who knew so well what he came for, must have eagerly scanned the metal as it was torn from the stones of the structure, and noted that "there was in it no piece of gold, nor one ring or true stone but all great

Court 14th December, A^o, 30^o (1538), is to be found among the State Papers Dom., 1538, ^v₃₃₉. On the 19th December Sir William Goring, the commissioner, returned an account of 118 ounces of gold "with stones, enamel and agate," 5,255 ounces of silver gilt, 162 ounces of parcel gilt, one mitre, four copes and one vestment as the result of this crusade against St. Richard. "Mon. Treasures," p. 43.

counterfeits," but that "the silver alone" would "amount near to two thousand marks." On that same night, too, he says, he "took possession of the cross of emeralds, the cross called 'Hierusalem,' another cross of gold, two chalices of gold with some silver plate."* And on the Sunday morning, when the shrine had been disposed of, "going to bed-ward," they went round into the choir and stood with their lights before the magnificent reredos. There, he writes, "we viewed the altar, which we purpose to bring with us. It will be worth the taking down and nothing thereof seen; but such a piece of work it is, that we think we shall not rid it, doing our best before Monday night or Tuesday morning. This done," he adds, "we intend both at Hyde and Saint Mary's, to sweep away all the rotten bones, that be called relics; which we may not omit lest it should be thought we care more for the treasure than for avoiding of the abomination of idolatry."† The result of the work, so far as the main point was concerned, was 1,035½ ounces of gold, 13,886 ounces of silver gilt, 300 ounces of silver and parcel gilt, and one mitre received by the treasurer of the royal jewel-house.‡ No mention whatever is made of the reception of

* These precious objects were probably gifts of Bishop Henry de Blois. The "cross of emeralds" is doubtless the "*alia crux aurea cum xxxiiii smaragdis*," No. 6 of the inventory printed in "Downside Review," Vol. iii., p. 41. "Hierusalem" is probably No. 1 of the inventory, and the two golden chalices Nos. 9 and 10.

† Wright, p. 218. ‡ "Mon. Treas.," Abbotsford Club, p. 40.

the magnificent jewels spoken of by Pollard in his letter.

Probably no shrine in the world could compare with the riches of that of St. Thomas at Canterbury. For three centuries treasures of every kind had been bestowed upon the tomb of the martyred archbishop from every part of the Christian world. Even at the beginning of the fourteenth century the inventory of jewels belonging to the shrine presents a goodly list of precious and artistic treasures.* According to Erasmus, "the least valuable portion was gold; every part glistened, shone and sparkled with rare and very large jewels, some of them exceeding the size of a goose's egg. . . . The prior with a white rod pointed out each jewel, telling its name in French, its value, and the name of its donor; for the principal of them were offerings sent by sovereign princes."† So, too, madame de Montrenil, who saw it just prior to its destruction when on her return from Scotland to France, " marvelled at the great riches thereof, saying it to be innumerable, and that if she had not seen it, all the men in the world could never have made her believe it."‡

* See "Erasmus' Pilgrimages," by J. Gough Nichols, 2nd ed., p. 191.

† *Ibid.*, p. 49.

‡ State Papers (ed. 1830), Part II., p. 583. Polydore Vergil's "Relation" (Camden Society, p. 30) contains the account of a Venetian who visited the shrine about the year 1500. "The tomb of St. Thomas the martyr, archbishop of Canterbury," he says,

In the autumn of 1538 St. Thomas was declared a traitor, and it was enjoined that henceforth "his images and pictures through the whole realm shall be put down and avoided out of all churches, chapels and other places; and that from henceforth the days used to be festival in his name shall not be observed, nor the service office, antiphons, collects and prayers in his name read, but rased and put out of all the books . . . upon pain of his majesty's indignation and imprisonment at his grace's pleasure."*

"exceeds all belief. Notwithstanding its great size, it is wholly covered with plates of pure gold; yet the gold is scarcely seen because it is covered with various precious stones, as sapphires, balasses, diamonds, rubies and emeralds; and wherever the eye turns something more beautiful than the rest is observed. Nor, in addition to these natural beauties, is the skill of art wanting, for in the midst of the gold are the most beautiful sculptured gems both small and large, as well such as are in relief as agates, onyxes, cornelians and cameos; and some cameos are of such size that I am afraid to name it; but everything is far surpassed by a ruby, not larger than a thumbnail, which is fixed at the right of the altar. The church is somewhat dark, and particularly in the spot where the shrine is placed, and when we went to see it the sun was near setting and the weather was cloudy; nevertheless I saw the ruby as if I had it in my hand. They say it was given by a king of France." This jewel was no doubt the "Regal of France," of which subsequent mention will be made. It seems, however, to have been a diamond.

* "Burnet's Records" (ed. Pocock), vi., 220. It is difficult to conceive that the so-called citation, trial and condemnation of the saint by a court sitting at Westminster can have taken place. The story passed current on the Continent, and is given by Pollini. Lingard thinks that the Bull "Cum Redemptor" of Paul III., dated Dec. 17, 1538, confirms the story. Canon Dixon (ii., p. 72 *note*) has shown that it does not necessarily do so.

As a necessary consequence of this condemnation of the saint came the spoliation of his tomb. Sander suggests that "the offence for which the most holy martyr was thus severely punished was nothing else but the wealth lavished upon his tomb and the necessity of finding some excuse for the pillage."* Even if this was not the case, the result was the same; and the process of casting down the shrine, collecting the plate and jewels, described as taking place at Winchester, was repeated at Canterbury. Here, however, the relics, which had been venerated for many generations, were apparently treated with special indignity, and torn from the sheltered tomb were committed to the flames.†

The plate was carried away to London. From the descriptions quoted above it is evident that the prize was worth having. "All above the stone work was first of wood, jewels of gold set with stone . . . wrought upon with gold wire," says the account from which Stowe derived his information. "Then again with jewels of gold, as broch[es images of angels and rings] ten or twelve together, cramped

* Lewis' Transl., p. 142. In this Marillac, the French ambassador, agrees, after declaring that Henry was so avaricious and covetous "that all the wealth of the world would not be enough to satisfy and content his ambition . . . from which has come the ruin of the abbeys and the spoiling of every church in which there was anything to take," he then adds: "St. Thomas is declared a traitor because his relics and bones were adorned with gold and stones" ("Inventaire Analytique," ed. Kaulek, p. 211).

† "The Relics of St. Thomas," by Rev. J. Morris, S.J. Fr. Morris shows that it is almost certain that the relics were burnt.

with gold into the ground of gold. The [spoils of which filled two] chests, such as six or eight men could but convey out of the church. At [one side was a stone, with] an angel of gold pointing thereunto, offered by the king of France: [which king Henry put] into a ring and wore it on his thumb."*

In the treasurer's Roll the weight of the plate obtained is thus recorded: The gold (including $2\frac{3}{4}$ ounces fine gold of coins) was no less than $4,994\frac{3}{4}$ ounces; the gilt plate weighed 4,425; the parcel gilt 840; and the plain silver 5,286.† At a subsequent date twenty-six ounces of gold with 4,090 of silver gilt or plain were added to the

* Nicholls *ut sup.*, p. 190, from Cott. MS. Tib., e. viii., f. 269. The history of this great jewel is interesting. In 1179 Louis VII. of France came to visit the shrine in company with king Henry. He offered at the tomb his golden cup and a rent of a hundred measures of wine yearly. Having passed the night in prayer before the saint's relics, he in the morning asked and received the "fraternity" in the chapter-house. Amongst his offerings is supposed to have been the great glory of the shrine, "that renowned precious stone that is called the Regal of France." From the thumb-ring, for which Henry VIII. used the jewel, it was apparently transferred to a collar. In the inventory of precious stones delivered to queen Mary the 10th of March, 1553-4, was "a collar of golde set with sixteen faire diamountes, whereof the Regal of Fraunce is one, and fourtene knottes or perles, in every knotte four perles" (B. Mus. Harl. MS., 611, 22). See Nichols, *Intro.*, lxxxvi.

† "Monastic Treas.," p. 40. Sander says (Lewis' *Trans.*, p. 143): "The king's receiver confessed that the gold and silver and precious stones and sacred vestments taken away from the shrine filled six-and-twenty carts. We may judge from this," he adds, "how great must have been the wealth of which the king robbed the other shrines, churches and monasteries."

spoils from Christ Church, Canterbury. Besides this wealth of precious metal, and the jewels of which there is no record, there was carried away to London four precious mitres, "two of silver gilt over-worked with pearls and precious stones;" a wooden throne covered at the parts called pommels with crimson velvet, and the handles of silver gilt; and a crozier ornamented with silver, called "Thomas Becket's staff."* Further, besides a number of fastenings for copes of gold and precious stones, nine pontifical rings and "a golden shell adorned with divers precious stones," there were taken for the king "eleven copes of gold cloth called 'gold Bawdekin.' Of these ten were white with the arms of . . . Morton, formerly archbishop, and the eleventh was ornamented with red roses." Also, "one covering for the upper part of an altar of white and red velvet splendidly worked."† These,

* In the inventory made in 1315 the pastoral staff of St. Thomas is thus described:—"Item. Baculus Sancti Thomæ de pyro, cum capite de nigro cornu." It was thus made of pear-wood with a crook of black horn. Erasmus says: "There (in the sacristy) we saw the pastoral staff of Saint Thomas. It appeared to be a cane covered with silver plate; it was of very little weight and no workmanship, nor stood higher than to the waist" (Nichols, p. 44, and *note* p. 175).

† R. O. Exch. Augt. Off. Treas. Roll, i., m. 110. Speaking of the treasures of Canterbury, Erasmus says: "Good God! what a display was there of silken vestments, what an array of golden candlesticks." The inventory (1315) before referred to, which may be seen printed in the Appendix to Dart's "History of the Church," pp. iv.-xviii., must be consulted fully to understand the amazing treasures which have perished. There were 65 "copes of

with other things, formed the plunder which Henry gathered into his treasure-house "from the goods of the late monastery of Christ Church, Canterbury."

In a similar way to that in which the shrine of St. Thomas was demolished other sanctuaries were invaded and pillaged. Throughout the length and breadth of England the same hands which were levelling the monasteries and the same spirit which was at work on them were engaged in the war against the departed saints and in appropriating the gifts, with which generations of pious Englishmen had honoured their tombs. It was the same story everywhere, with the place and actors alone changed. One other instance of this work of desecration calls for special notice. The shrine of St. Cuthbert, at Durham, is fully described by one who remembered its state before the destruction. It "was exalted," he says, "with most curious workmanship of fine and costly green marble, all limned and gilded with gold, having four seats or places convenient under the shrine for the pilgrims or lame men sitting on their knees to lean and rest upon at the time of their devout offerings and fervent prayers to God and holy Saint Cuthbert for his miraculous relief and succour, which being never profession" given by suffragan bishops and abbots besides many more. The list of crosses, chalices and church furniture is very lengthy. Among the chasubles belonging to the shrine was one given by Sir John Plukenet, knight, of purple cloth with golden pine-apples, and a large orfrey before and behind (see Nichols, p. 192).

wanting, made the shrine to be so richly invested that it was estimated to be one of the most sumptuous monuments in England, so great were the offerings and jewels bestowed upon it."* Also, the author says, that "when then they . . . did offer anything to it, if it were either gold or silver or jewels, straitway it was hung on the shrine. And if it were any other thing, as unicorn horn, elephant tooth, or such like thing, then it was hung with the Feretory, at the end of the shrine."†

It was towards the end of the year 1539 that Dr. Legh arrived to make an end of this venerated and richly adorned tomb of St. Cuthbert. The account of this work of destruction is best given in the words of the author just cited. "They found," he says, "many worthy and goodly jewels . . . but especially one precious stone belonging to the said shrine, which by the estimate of (the) three visitors and their skilful lapidaries which they brought with them, was worth in value a king's ransom. After the spoil of his ornaments and jewels, coming nearer his sacred body, thinking to have found nothing but dust and bones, and finding the chest that he did lie in very strongly bound with iron, the goldsmith did take a great forge-hammer of a smith and did break the said chest open. And when they had opened the chest, they found him lying whole, uncorrupt, with his face bare and his beard as it had

* "Rites of Durham," Surtees Soc., pp. 3, *et. seq.*

† *Ibid.*, p. 79.

been a fortnight's growth, and all his vestments upon him as he was accustomed to say mass withal, and his meet wand (crozier?) of gold lying beside him. Then when the goldsmith did perceive that he had broken one of his legs when he broke open the chest he was very sorry for it and did cry, 'Alas! I have broken one of his legs.' Then Dr. Henley (one of the commissioners) hearing him say so, called upon him and bade him cast down his bones. Then he made answer again that he could not get them asunder for the sinews and the skin held it that it would not come asunder. Then Dr. Legh did step up to see if it were so or not, and did turn himself about and spoke Latin to Dr. Henley, that he was lying whole. Yet Dr. Henley would give no credit to his word but still cried 'Cast down his bones.' Then Dr. Legh made answer, 'If you will not believe me come up yourself and see him.' Then Dr. Henley went up to him and handled him, and saw that he was whole and uncorrupt."*

The body thus found was carried into the sacristy till the further pleasure of the king should be known, and shortly after "the prior and monks buried him in the ground, under the same place where his shrine was exalted." The jewels, of which as usual no account is made, together with the plate from the cathedral treasury amounting to 3,641 $\frac{1}{4}$ ounces of silver and 24 of gold and stones, were conveyed to Henry. From the shrine itself 1,578 $\frac{1}{2}$ ounces of

* *Ibid.*, p. 86.

precious metal were also accounted for by the king's receiver.*

It is not to be supposed that this rough treatment of the relics of saints hitherto so much venerated was approved of by the people. Indications are not wanting that they saw with sorrow what they were powerless to prevent, for, as Marillac, the French ambassador, informed his master about this time, "the people were much more attached to the old religion than to the new opinions."† One of Crumwell's numerous spies reported the opinions of the servant of bishop Tunstal, of Durham, on this matter. The document is of considerable length, but portions of it are of very great interest. "I would gladly," he writes, "have found an occasion that the servant should declare his mind in the evidence of others, and so at supper and in the presence of the goodman of the Taberd, at Royston . . . as we talked of the suppression of houses of religion, by his own occasion, (he) show(ed) us, that before he came to Huntingdon he overtook certain men that came from the commissions and brought with them in their males (trunks) behind them copes and other abbey gear. He showed us that the prior of Mountgrace was fully-minded not to give up his house, and that he answered the servant of a friend of his, who had sent to him for very friendliness that

* R. O. Exch. Augt. Off. Mins. Accts., 30-31 Hen. VIII., 217, m. 2.

† Inventaire analytique des archives, ed. Kaulek, No. 119.

he should meet Mr. Henley, coming towards his house to suppress it, three or four miles from the house and present him with a gelding of the price of five marks, and desire him to be a good master to him, which would serve his purpose well. Unto which messenger he said, he thanked his master for his good will, but he had no gelding of such a price, and in case he had, he neither intended to meet him, nor give him a hair of the tail to be good to him. . . . 'Lord,' quoth I, 'what manner of man is that prior? Is he a man of any discretion?' 'Yea marry he is,' quoth he, 'and a great learned man and so be all his brethren, and they be like-minded all to him.' 'How doth the country favour him?' quoth I. 'Marry,' quoth he, 'wondrously well, and they lament and bewail his cause very sore in their hearts.'"

"And after that he told us another tale; how he was with the visitors one time, when they handled relics very irreverently and spoiled them of the gold and silver that was about them, and cast them away when they had done, and gave unto him certain bones garnished with silver, and bade him pluck off the silver and garnish his dagger withal. (These) he took at their hands and keepeth them yet and other bones likewise, which the visitors had cast away and he gathered up afterwards. And, he added, he had rather go a begging than he would take the silver from them."*

* R. O. State Papers, Dom., 1539, *v*. *stt*.

From the spoiling of shrines and relics, and from the pillage of cathedral and monastic treasuries, Henry amassed a booty of immense value. Putting on one side the actual jewels, which were undoubtedly worth considerable sums of money, and the amount of plate subtracted by the royal commissioners and other agents engaged on the work of gathering the harvest, the mass of ecclesiastical plate which reached the treasure house was very considerable. Besides the adornments torn from the tombs of saints and the reliquaries from out of which their bones had been cast, the plunder comprised miscellaneous church ornaments of all sorts: sacred chalices and patens, monstrances for exposing the Blessed Sacrament and vessels for reserving it, crosses and candlesticks for the altar, processional and pastoral staves, pontifical mitres, rings and gloves, cruets, censers and silver dishes of every kind, and even jewelled clasps torn from missals and other service books were conveyed to London to the king.* The sacred character of the greater number of the articles was no protection

* Besides the weight of plate, a miscellaneous variety of ecclesiastical ornaments were brought to the treasure house. For example: "A monstrance having a great beryl in the midst and set with divers counterfeit stones," from Ramsey; a silver crown, mitres without number, "a pair of beryl candlesticks garnished with silver gilt," "great agates, cameos, coarse pearles" set in gold, from St. Albans; a monstrance from Gloucester; a mitre "garnished with flowers of silver and silver bells with counterfeit stones" from Canterbury; "a table of silver gilt with two leaves, the inside set with sapphires and other stones" from Ely; "a gospel book

against profanation, just as artistic value and costly workmanship did not save them from the royal melting-pot. The worth of the plunder was calculated by its weight, and this, as entered upon the roll of the treasurer, may be stated as follows:— Pure gold, 14,531 $\frac{3}{4}$ ounces; silver gilt, 129,520 ounces; parcel gilt, 73,774 $\frac{3}{4}$; and silver, 67,600 $\frac{1}{4}$.* This vast collection was estimated by Sir John Williams to be worth in money of that date at the melting price, £63,531 15s. 1d. To this, however, certain additions must be made. The keeper received in money for plate and other ornaments sold at the dissolution £15,550 1s. 3 $\frac{1}{2}$ d.† and nearly £7,000 worth of plate was forwarded to the augmentation office in the earlier years of the dissolutions.‡ Hence the money value of the gold and silver spoils actually received by the king and estimated only

plated upon with a crucifix, Mary and John, of silver, and a text of a gospel book plated," etc., etc. ("Monastic Treasures").

Curious deductions are made from the accounts, thus: The king took the use of a "Gospeller," ornamented with silver and precious stones and 60s. is allowed for its price; £15 12s. 1d. was deducted for lead, wax and paper in a parcel of plate which had been priced as silver; and 40s. 5d. because a silver gilt image of St. John from Abingdon proved lighter than was estimated." (Exch. Augt. Off. Treas. Roll, i. m. 13d.).

In the accounts of the keeper of the jewel house, 7,101 $\frac{1}{2}$ ounces of plate are said to be lost in the melting by wax, lead, etc. ("Monastic Treasures," pp. 54-63).

* "Monastic Treasures," Abbotsford Club, p. 53, *et seq.*

† *Ibid.*, pp. 68-9.

‡ R. O. Exch. Augt. Off. Treas. Roll, i. m. 4d.

at the weighing price was more than £85,000, or very nearly a million sterling of the present money.*

From the ecclesiastical plate thus appropriated by Henry to the sacred vestments the transition is natural. Ancient inventories show that there were in the monastic sacristies many copes, chasubles, and much other altar furniture, of gold and silver cloth, of silver richly and artfully embroidered with the needle, of brocades and stuffs of Eastern origin, which would have been esteemed priceless works of art in this age. Much must have perished in the wanton destruction that characterized the work of the royal commissioners at the time of the suppres-

* For the full account of the amount of plate and what became of it see the Appendix to this volume. A good deal was expended for "new trimming images of gold," *e.g.*, an image of Our Lady. No less than plate and money to the value of £46,636 1s. 1¼d. was given "to the proper hand of the king" ("Monastic Treas.," etc., p. 92), and £810 was spent in the expenses of offices and collecting, nearly £70 being for the carriage of plate "as well by boats as carts to Westminster and Greenwich" (p. 93). As an example of the way the plate was relegated to the melting-pot may be given a few items from an account of "plate molten by order of the king's council," 1 July, 1557 (Ed. VI.). In this there are "gold coming from defacing 3 books, a mitre two gloves;" "glass garnished with gold facing 3 books;" "two candlesticks, 2 cruets, 2 chalices;" "a ship of mother of pearl and silver;" "silver from a 'glass of berryl';" "three mitres, 2 gold crosses and an 'ark';" "a ring of gold called a pontifical having an eagle and in her breast a small ruby;" "a plate of gold being of a monstrance;" "3 cross stars all gilt;" "4 rings of silver called pontificals, 2 having stones therein and the third a pearl." It is noted that the stones coming from the mitres, rings, etc., defaced are still in hand (R. O. Audit Office, Bundle 1533, Roll. 1).

sions. The skilfully-wrought metal work of shrine and reliquary, more precious for the art of the workman than the worth of the material, when torn from its place by the tools of despoilers became but a mass fit for the melting. So, in like manner, the triumphs of loom and crewel, amid the desolation of places where they were prized and cared for, were too often regarded as pieces of useless lumber.

They were generally looked upon as things upon which a little money was to be raised to pay the expenses of the commissioners or the wages of the servants. "Money to dispatch the household and monks," writes the indefatigable Dr. Layton, of Bisham abbey, "we must make of the rotten copes and bells;" and he further says that they had already "made sale of the old vestments within the chapter-house."* The accounts of such auctions show that a few shillings, or in many instances only a few pence, represented the sums which the sacred vestments fetched.†

Scores, chiefly of cloth of gold and silver, of tissue, or worked in pearls, were preserved for the king's use. Thus, a set of "cloth of gold with ornaments of blue velvet" and three altar frontals from Beaulieu, another of "cloth of silver worked with fleur-de-lys and angels" from Canons Ashby,‡ were saved from

* R. O. Crum. Corr., xx., No. 11.

† See Scudamore's account. Wright, p. 266, etc.

‡ These vestments have a history of their own. Richard Colles, the prior, ordered them from "Thomas Typlady citizen and broderer of London," and a "cope and two tunics," for which

the general sales* and sent up to London. So, from St. Swithin's, Winchester, "six copes of blue tissue and one piece of arras, with the image of the Passion;" from St. Augustine's, Bristol, "certain garnishing of vestments of silver gilt, enamelled, and fret with small pearls;" from Cirencester, "a cope embroidered with the story of Jesse, with cloth of gold upon crimson velvet and two copes of cloth of gold;" from St. Peter's, Gloucester, "three copes of silver tissue, two of gold and one of blue"† were reserved for royal service.‡

the convent promised to pay £39; they were brought to Stourbridge fair and delivered to the servants of the abbey only a short time before the dissolution (Exch. Augt. Off. Misc. Bk., 120, f. 215). £29 was still due to Typlady when the vestments were taken for the king and handed to Sir Thomas Pope, the treasurer of the Court of Augmentations. This sum Typlady claimed from the king (*Ibid.*, Bk. 404, f. 220), and he was ultimately paid in full (*Ibid.*, Treas. Roll, i., m. 12d).

* R. O. Exch. Augt. Off. Treasurer's Roll, i. These are merely hap-hazard examples of many such entries.

† *Ibid.*, Misc. Bk., 494.

‡ The portion of ecclesiastical spoils so reserved from Westminster is rich. Of altar furniture there is specially noted: "A basin or dish of a precious stone named agate, ornamented with gold, precious stones and pearls, and weighing 38 ounces. Two altar hangings, called frontals, of cloth of gold worked with lions, fleur-de-lys and the arms of the late — Islip, formerly abbot of the monastery." "Five copes of needlework (one called St. Peter's cope, one the cope with angels of pearl and three others called Jesses) with two tunicles, one chasuble and seven silver gilt buttons, together with albs stoles and maniples of the same work." "Sixteen copes of cloth of gold of various colours: one of blue with a chasuble, two tunicles, an alb, stole and maniple belonging to the same: another cope of cloth of gold with the orpheries

The vestments purchased at the various sales, which took place in every part of England, were dispersed throughout the country, and large numbers even were shipped to foreign lands. In many instances the auctions were attended by merchants who followed the footsteps of the royal commissioners and purchased largely for speculative purposes. Thus, one Hugh Payne appears to have purchased the vestments of St. Martin's-le-Grand; John Blackewall, a cleric, "divers copes of Worcester;"* Joan Mynne, three copes of silk and four of bawdekin of Westminster, and Edward Elrington obtained other copes and ornaments of the same place for £102.† A market was found in places beyond the seas for the ecclesiastical ornaments and vestments thus discarded, and not only were the sentiments of the nation at large outraged by the pillage of churches, and at the sight of the royal visitors riding along the roads with "copes and other abbey gear" as their chief luggage, but the seaport towns of the continent were astonished at the desecration. "The lord of Barrow," wrote an English priest from Holland in 1540, "showed me that there were brought to his town and Antwerp so many rich and goodly copes out of England to sell these years splendidly worked with 'Islips' and adorned with golden images: 14 other copes of cloth of gold of velvet and golden portcullises worked on them." These and other altar furniture were taken for the king's use. *Treas. Roll*, i., m. 109d.

* *Ibid.*, *Roll*, ii., m. 9d.

† *Ibid.*, m. 106d.

past that it caused them all no less to marvel than in a manner to mourn to see them come to a sale that were prepared to the service of God. Whereupon rose rumours that we had no masses in the realm (of England).”*

A large proportion also of the Church spoils were without doubt scattered over England, and possibly used by many for secular purposes. “Nothing more is said about the abbeys,” wrote the Venetian ambassador at the time; “they are all suppressed and their revenues annexed to the crown, some being given and usurped by the nobility, who convert them into palaces, furnishing them with the church ornaments (when there are any) and rendering them heirlooms in their families.”† A learned historian, speaking of what followed upon the pillage of churches under Edward VI., draws a picture which must equally have represented the results of ecclesiastical spoliation under his father. “Although,” he says, “some profit was hereby raised to the king’s exchequer, yet the far greatest part of the prey came to other hands: Insomuch that many private men’s parlours were hung with altar-cloths, their tables and beds covered with copes, instead of carpets and coverlids; and many made carousing cups of the sacred chalices, as once Balshazzar celebrated his drunken feast in the sanctified vessels of the Temple. It was a sorry house, and not worth

* R. O. State Papers, Dom., 1540, 203.

† Venetian State Papers, v., p. 347.

the naming, which had not somewhat of this furniture in it, though it were only a fair large cushion made of a cope or altar-cloth, to adorn their windows, or make their chairs appear to have somewhat in them of a chair of state. Yet how contemptible were these trapings, in comparison of those vast sums of money which were made of jewels, plate and cloth of tissue, either conveyed beyond the seas or sold at home." *

It is unnecessary to dwell further upon the sales which preceded the destruction of the religious houses, and at which the furniture of the churches and effects of the convents were disposed of to the highest bidder, often at ridiculously small sums. Altars and images, the wood of choir stalls and chapel screens, candlesticks and lamps, tables and forms, tombs, gravestones, pavement, timber, iron and glass, in fact, everything which would add a penny to the total of the plunder came to the hammer. In some cases the grant of an entire building with all its effects, in others the purchase of the goods as a whole, did away with the necessity of a public auction; but these were comparatively few in number, and as a general rule a sale, conducted in the chapter house, church or cloister, was the method by which a monastery was cleared out as a preparatory step to dealing with the building itself.

Wanton waste was of course inseparable from such

* Haylin's "Eccl. Restaurata," ed. 1670, p. 134.

wholesale destruction, but it is impossible to suppress the word of grief at what the world has in this way lost beyond recovery. No other instance is needed to rouse in all feelings stronger than regret than the loss of the precious manuscripts and other contents of the monastic libraries which disappeared in the general havoc. How little such things were cared for may be gathered by the contemptuous references which occur in the account of the sales which took place. "Old books in the choir, 6d.;" "old books in the vestry sold to Robert Dorington, 8d.;" "old books and a cofer in the library, 2s.;"* "a flat chest with five books in it, 8d.;" "a mass book with its desk, 8d.;" "fourteen great books in the choir, 14s.,"† are samples of the sales of manuscripts which would now be of immense value.

"The English monks," says Fuller, were bookish themselves, and much inclined to hoard up monuments of learning." John Bale has left on record his experience as to the way in which the treasures described by Leland disappeared upon the destruction of the monasteries. The purchasers of the houses used the manuscripts for every vile and common necessity. "Grocers and soap-sellers" bought them for their business purposes, and "whole ships full" were sent "over the sea to the bookbinders." While one merchant bought "the contents of two noble libraries for forty shillings'

* Scudamore accounts. Wright, p, 269, etc.

† R. O. Augt. Office Misc. Bk., 408, f. 74, etc.

price," and "this stuff hath he occupied instead of grey paper," adds the author, "by the space of more than these ten years: and yet he hath store enough for as many years to come."

Nothing illustrates this wholesale and wanton destruction better than the dearth of English Church service and music books, so much lamented in these days. That the choral schools of the country produced good results in the way of music, and that they were in full swing at the time of the destruction of the monastic houses, cannot be doubted. And yet practically nothing is known of the compositions of later English musicians or their works, so complete has been the destruction of this manuscript music.*

* Erasmus speaks of the English love of choral song. "It is," he says, "so agreeable to the monks, especially in England, that youths boys, etc., every morning sing to the organ the mass of the Virgin Mary, with the most harmonious modulations of voice" (Owen and Blakeway's "Shrewsbury," ii., 50 *note*). As a sample of the music which must have existed in every monastery, a portion of a much-mutilated inventory of Worcester may be given. It will be found printed in Green's "Worcester," App. vii. A glance at the original (B. Mus. Harl., 604) will show what a small fragment it is. "The maister of the chapell." "Item, a surples for the maister of the children and 6 surpliesses for the children: A masse bocke of—with prycksonge wheryn is 5 parts and 4 parts. Four prycksonge mass books of paper. Two other books—one with anthems and *salves* in him. Four little prycksong books of masses. Five mass books of 5 parts. Five books—with *Salve Festa Dies* and scrolls belonging to the 2 paper books. In them, be the 5 parts of other songs—a singing note book 'burdyde'—a parchment book of *Salves* 'burdyde' 2 masses of 5 parts in parchment scrolls—a paper book of 4 parts—a paper book with the '*invitatories*,' *Benedictus*, *Te Deum* in prickyng. There be 3 or 4 anthems in *scroll*."

In the same way, how very few copies of the various service books, such as Antiphonals, Graduals, Ordinals, Missals, etc., does the present age possess. And yet many thousands—in fact, not fewer than a quarter of a million, according to the highest authority upon the matter—must have been in actual use at the various churches at this period.*

After a monastery had been dismantled, and the churches, to use Dr. London's expression, "defaced," then came the process of realizing the value of the materials of the building itself. The

* Speaking of the destruction of service books, Mr. Maskell (*"Monumenta Ritualia,"* 3rd ed., i., p. cxcvii.) says: "Of each (*i.e.*, the eight or nine books previously named) not only must there have been almost countless copies in manuscript in the year 1530, but there had been many large editions of several of them printed. Yet now, in about three hundred years, we may say of them that as a class they have all but totally disappeared. Examples of any one, missal or breviary or manual, it matters not, are of extraordinary rarity. Of some none are extant, and by far the greater part of those we do possess are mutilated and imperfect." The learned author calculates that when the old ritual ceased at least two-thirds of the copies must have been good, since the greatest care was taken of them. "Every church and chantry and chapel was supplied." At St. John the Baptist's, Glastonbury, in 1421, there were "3 missals, 3 graduals, 1 psalter, 3 antiphonals, 1 legend, 2 collect and 1 processional" (Warner, App., xcix.). "Monasteries had hundreds." At Ramsey there were "70 breviaries; 100 psalters, 4 hymnals, 32 graduals, 39 processionals" (B. Mus. Cott. Roll, xi., 16). And altogether, Mr. Maskell calculates (p. ccii.) that there could have been "not less than 250,000 volumes in actual use, besides those which might have been laid up and treasured in the Archives." He further adds that they must have been purposely destroyed to prevent men "worshipping any longer after the manner of their forefathers."

chief source of profit was the lead with which the monasteries were mostly covered. It was stripped from the roof of the finest church without hesitation, and melted at a fire made probably with wood of stalls, screen work or rood. Orders were sent, in what appears at this date the most cold-blooded manner, to wreck the roof and "pull" the lead of some of the most glorious architectural monuments which England then contained. Bands of workmen went about from place to place throughout the country, lit their fires in the naves or chancels of abbey churches, and occupied themselves for days, and even in some cases weeks, in melting the coverings of roofs, and the gutters, spouts and pipes from the building into pigs and fadders, the sale of which might add a few pounds to the royal plunder. The same story was repeated in every place. Like a swarm of locusts the royal wreckers went forth over the land, and what they found fair and comely they left black with their smelting fires and useless ruins. For eleven weeks, as an example, the commissioners wandered about Somerset, "defacing, destroying and prostrating the churches, cloisters, belfreys, and other buildings of the late monasteries." At Keynsham £12 was paid to one Richard Walker for melting the lead on church, cloister and steeple. At Hinton Charterhouse, Witham, Montacute, Bruton, Athelney and Buckland the work was repeated, and at Bath half-a-crown was paid for the casting of each of 156 fadders, the result of the process at the

priory church, when the metal from the roofs of the church and other monastic buildings passed into the melting pot.* At Wigmore abbey, to quote but one more example, the work took James Reynolds, the royal metal melter in those parts, more than eight days to tear down the lead and cast it into pigs. Day and night the process was watched "for fear some" of the royal spoil "should be stolen by the people."†

The casting completed, other workmen arrived to convey the foddors to a place of safety, where they might remain till purchased or used. Along the roads teams of horses dragged waggons weighted with the lead, and down the navigable rivers barges carried it to the seacoast. The metal from Wigmore, for example, was carried into the castle, and thither also was brought in waggons the stuff from Bordesley and Lylleshull; while from the latter house a caravan of ninety-three carts took a portion of it to a royal manor some twenty miles distant.‡ The lead from off the great cathedral church of Coventry, estimated to be worth £647, was stacked, together with that from other churches in the town, within the desecrated building,§ while that from the church and monastery of Bury St. Edmunds, "now pulled off," as the account has it, and worth, according to the estimate, £3,302, remained on the site. Many

* R. O. Exch. Augt. Off. Mins. Accts., 30-31 Hen. VIII., 224, m. 17.

† *Ibid.*, 230, m. 26d.

‡ *Ibid.*, m.m. 27-27d.

§ *Ibid.*, 226, m. 11d.

of the royal castles, as Worcester and Tutbury, were turned into storehouses. Round the cathedral of Lincoln the metal melted from the roofs of the monastic churches of the district was piled for use, and thousands of tons were floated down the Severn to Bristol to be sold for export.*

What has been said of the lead is equally true of the bells found in the monasteries. They were a source of great profit to the king, as the metal was valuable for the making of guns, and was readily purchased by the London merchants, and not infrequently by the people of the neighbourhood for their parish church. Thus £832 worth of metal, from the broken bells of Lincolnshire, was given, in 1542, to Sir Charles Morris, under royal warrant, to make guns and other engines of war. At the same time it was noted that 68 bells still remained unsold † in that district. Of purchases by private adventurers there were many examples. Thus Henry Over, a grocer, of Coventry, purchased many of the bells in that town; William Gerard, a London haberdasher, and Thomas Walker, a vintner, speculated jointly in 80,000 lbs. weight of broken metal, for which they paid £800; Sir Richard Gresham paid £31 for the bells of Blakeney and Burnham, in Norfolk, and John

* R. O. Exch. Augt. Off. Misc. Bk., 472. Grant "to one John Smith of Bristol for his ship ready to sail, in consideration of £200, two hundred fadders of lead out of such our store as there remaineth, good weight." The Scudamore papers show what vast quantities went down the Severn. B. Mus. Add. MS., 11,041, ff. 93, *et seq.*

† *Ibid.*, Mins. Accts., 34-35 Hen. VIII., 220.

Core, a grocer, of London, who bought very largely at one time, took 144,500 lbs. of the metal for £1,345.*

The accounts for the delivery of part of this large order are extant. They include the expenses for dismantling belfreys and pulling down bells, for carriage of the metal to London to the "king's weighhouse," where they were to be delivered to Core the grocer, for the wages of labourers engaged in breaking up, and "14d. paid to each man riding to Gracedieu and Leicester to look at the bells." Also charges were made for "hammers, iron wedges, crowes of iron, chisels and other instruments bought and used at different times for breaking" them up, as well as for sundry barrels bought at different times and places in which to pack the broken metal. In this work of destruction the labourers were employed for seventy-five days.†

Some, however, of the bells were sold unbroken to merchants, who carried them abroad. Thus, in a letter written in the year 1539 to one of Thomas Crumwell's gentlemen, an Englishman complains of the treatment he had received from the Spanish inquisition. "The causes of the persecution," he says, "were, refusal to acknowledge Henry VIII. a heretic and alleged approval of the destruction

* *Ibid.*, Treas. Roll., ii., m. 9.

† *Ibid.*, Mins. Accts., 31-32 Hen. VIII., 236, m. 37. This portion of the 144,500 lbs. bought by Core came from Leicestershire. The bells broken up numbered 56, and weighed 48,000 lbs. (m. 7d.).

of monasteries and selling church bells." The whole matter arose from Thomas Edwards, a London merchant, bringing in a ship "a brazen bell, which might weigh two kintals." A priest who passed and saw it said, in the hearing of the writer of the complaint: "What a good Christian is your king of England to put down the monasteries and to take away the bells!" The Englishman defended his sovereign, and thus involved himself in difficulties with the authorities of the inquisition.*

In some few instances the monastery bells were saved from destruction by being purchased by the inhabitants of neighbouring parishes. Thus those of Buckfastleigh, in Devon, paid £33 15s. to Sir Thomas Arundel for the five bells of the old abbey; † at the dissolution of Ford the people bought five bells for their parish, and those of Churchstoke collected £26 13s. 4d. to save the bells of Newnham ‡ from destruction. Out of the two hundred bells collected by Sir John Scudamore from the monasteries of Hereford, Shropshire, Staffordshire, and Worcester, the inhabitants of Roucester claimed three as belonging to their parish church, since they had been rung for their services as well as for the choral offices of the canons. § In the same way the people of Abergavenny laid claim to three bells of the dissolved priory upon the ground that their

* Ellis, "Orig. Letters," ii. Ser., ii., p. 139.

† R. O. Exch. Aug. Off. Mins. Accts., 30-31 Hen. VIII., 223, m. 12.

‡ *Ibid.*, m. 26.

§ *Ibid.*, 230, m. 6.

ancestors had collected money for them and they had been always regarded as the property of the people.*

Something must now be said about the destruction of the buildings themselves. In some instances the entire structure was disposed of by the king. Thus, for example, the city of Worcester paid £541 for the two convents of the Black and Grey friars,† and chancellor Audeley purchased the buildings of Athelney abbey for £20,‡ but as a rule the buildings were sold piecemeal. Thus, to take one or two examples, at Bath one Anthony Payne bought "all the iron and glass of the monastery for £30. Another, Robert Cocks purchased the entire

* *Ibid.*, Misc. Bk., 117, f. 18. The reasons assigned are curious. 1. Thomas Ap Letham, aged 66 years, deposed at the inquiry "That one called Jenkyn Ap Letham, of Abergavenny, his father, being a smith, did work of his own proper costs and charges to the setting up of the said bells in the late priory, and also besides paid his part to the being of the said bells, how much he cannot tell." 2. John Ap Poll Ap John, aged 80 years, deposed that "One John Ap Vaughan, of Abergavenny, his father-in-law, did pay 20s. for his part, and his father-in-law's brother 13s. 4d. to the being of the said bells. Furthermore he saith that the parish of Abergavenny should ring and did ring the same bells if any of their servants died without license or restraint of the prior or convent, and so did use to do till the suppression of the said late priory. And also the said parish did find all manner of costs and charges belonging to the said bells. Also further, he saith that he was one of them with Jenkyn Ap Letham" and others "that went into the country with games and plays to gather money to pay for the aforesaid bells."

† *Ibid.*, Mins. Accts., 30-31 Hen. VIII., 230, m. 5.

‡ *Ibid.*, 224, m. 6d.

'dorter' for £10, a third, Walter Dennys obtained the 'fratry' for £6, and Henry Bewchyn 'the cloisters' for £8."* At Walsingham the "windows, doors, stone, called freestone, glass, iron, slate and tiles" were disposed of in lots for a total of £55 15s. 11d.† At the destruction of Dover priory one "Adrian the brewer" paid £7 for the tiles and timber, another, Thomas Portway, obtained "the roof of the Lady chapel" for thirteen shillings and fourpence, and the "grave stones and altar stones" for twelve shillings, and the commissioner admits having taken twenty ton of "rotten timber" for his own use.‡

That there was, throughout the whole process of destruction, great waste, that in comparison with the original cost of the buildings the paltry sums received were altogether inadequate and that the crown actually only obtained a tithe of the real value of the confiscated property does not admit of doubt. As an example of this, the dissolution of the abbey of Pipwell may be cited. At the first coming of the commissioners Sir William Parr obtained as a gift the paving of the dormitory, and carried some of it away at once. Then followed apparently a general scramble of the people in the neighbourhood, and a great deal of glass, iron and lead was stolen. One man carried off the two doors of the brewhouse, and another, a tinker, caught in the act of appro-

* *Ibid.*, m. 5d. † *Ibid.*, 31-32 Hen. VIII., 255, m. 10d.

‡ *Ibid.*, Misc. Bk., 109, Nos. 22, 26.

priating some lead, was hanged at Northampton. Sir William Parr helped himself to the fish out of the east and west ponds and "stored" them. Each monk carried away the contents of his chamber. Shortly after the suppression "a strong press in the dormitory," which contained the title deeds, was broken open, and it was impossible to determine what had been abstracted. The floor of the steeple was pulled down when the commissioners dismounted the bells, "and at the same time the desks in the choir and all the windows in the infirmary were broken up and sold by the servants" of the royal officials.*

In the work of wrecking the finest monuments and most costly buildings, which took place all over the country, there does not appear to have been any hesitation on the part of Henry or his servants. There was never any question of sparing anything which could not be used for farm or other purposes, or by the demolition of which a few pounds might be added to the sum total of the plunder. Thus in every case, as at St. Mary's, Winchester, the superfluous buildings were church, chapter-house, dormi-

* *Ibid.*, No. 29. Numerous examples of the destruction of buildings for the sake of the lead might be given. The roofing of the magnificent minster of Sherborne, with that of bell tower and dormitory, was purchased for £230. The stone, iron, etc., of the friars in Fleet Street, London, for £125. The lead on the church of St. Elphege, Cripplegate, fetched £60; that on St. Mary's Abbey, York, £800; that on Evesham, £260, etc., etc. (*Ibid.*, Treas. Roll, iii., m. 17d).

tory, frater, and those allowed to stand were the superior's "lodging with offices."* The "superfluous buildings" were demolished without any scruple. Thus John Freeman, one of those engaged in the work, wrote that he was to pull down all monastic buildings except what might be of use for farm purposes. In Lincolnshire, where he was then occupied, there were more great houses than in any other part of England. The walls were thick and there were few to buy. "To pull them down," he says, "will cost the king a good deal," and so it is best to get the bells and lead, "which will rise well." And "this done to pull down the roofs, battlements and stairs and let the walls stand, and charge some with them as a quarry of stone to make sales of as they that have need will fetch."†

All this destruction, however, was not accom-

* *Ibid.*, Misc. Bk., 494, f. 11.

† R. O. Crum. Corr., xii., 64. In the same way Crumwell is informed from Boston that as there was very little stone in those parts the buildings would be most useful (*Ibid.*, xxxii., 27). The mayor and aldermen of Worcester also asked for the friars' houses there, which they afterwards purchased, to repair the walls, roads and bridges (*Ibid.*, l., 13). The buildings of St. Augustine's, Canterbury, were used in the same way. On portions of the old monastery considerable sums were spent to adapt it to the requirements of a royal residence, the rest became the city quarry. Thus in 1542-3 "St. Michael's gate (Burgate) was extensively repaired. Nine loads of stone were obtained from the recently dissolved monastery of St. Augustines. Nothing was paid for the material, but a man received 13½d. for carriage and two labourers were paid for the destructive work, which lasted four days" (Hist. MSS. Comm. 9th Rept., App. p. 153. City of Canterbury Records).

plished without an attempt being made to stay the king's hand in some cases. Thus Roland Lee, the bishop of Coventry and Lichfield, and the mayor and aldermen of Coventry vainly tried to induce Henry to spare the cathedral church of that city. The bishop begged Crumwell most earnestly for this favour. "My good lord," he says, "help me and the city both in this, that the church may stand whereby I may keep my name and the city have commodity and ease to their desire."* The mayor also declared that "the lack and decay of it will be not only a great defacing of the said city, but also a great hurt and inconvenience to all the inhabitants there in time of plagues. The friars' churches there being already suppressed and no place for the infected people and others, who are no small number in plague time, to resort to, but only to the parish churches having but two in all the city." Wherefore the city begs that letters may be sent to Dr. London "to stay and give sparing to the defacement of the said church."† These appeals, however, were unheeded. The church was dismantled, unroofed, and, although a magnificent example of English architecture with three spires, was pulled to pieces for the sake of its materials. Its fate is only a sample of what befell hundreds of monastic churches at this period. Some churches, or in several instances portions of the entire buildings, were saved by the prompt action of the

* Wright, p. 238.

† R. O. State Papers, Dom., 1539, 7.

people, who by an offer of ready money redeemed them from destruction. Thus the parishioners of Crowland paid £26 "for the south aisle of their church" and £30 for two of the old abbey bells.* Those of Romsey saved the fine Convent church from destruction with £100.† Richard Berdes and the inhabitants of Malvern purchased the church, bell-tower, dormitory, refectory and great barn of the monastery for £20,‡ and the people of Atherstone bought the priory church and two bells for £35.§ In the same way the church of Southwark was obtained from the king by the inhabitants of the borough, "Dr. Gardiner, bishop of Winchester, putting to his helping hand."|| The townspeople of St. Alban's gave £400 for the great abbatial church, and those of Crediton £200 for the collegiate building in that place.¶

* R. O. Exch. Augt. Off. Mins. Accts., 30-31 Hen. VIII., 217, m. 5. As a matter of fact the north aisle was the one saved.

† Mr. Baigent's MSS. collections. By an error it is stated in page 312, *note*, that £400 was paid for this building. The deed, dated 20 Feb. 35 Hen. VIII. (1554), shows that only £100 was expended by the inhabitants. This is much below John Foster's valuation (p. 312), and very possibly the building had been despoiled and neglected during the interval. A portion also of the church belonged to the inhabitants, and served as their parish church.

‡ *Ibid.*, 210, m. 6.

§ *Ibid.*, 226, m. 12d. These are only given as samples, and could be multiplied to almost any extent.

|| Stow, ed. 1615, p. 579.

¶ Blomefield ("Hist. Norfolk," i., pp. 733-4) relates that the inhabitants of Wymondham claimed part of the church there and

In concluding this brief account of the spoils, which Henry gathered into the royal purse by the overthrow of the monastic system and the destruction and sacking of the abbeys and convents of England, it is well to state, as far as it is possible to do so, the total amount of ecclesiastical plunder actually received by him. It is necessary, however, to bear in mind that many sums of money were disbursed, as well as royal grants of lands and possessions made, which do not enter into the ordinary accounts,* and that the figures as stated

petitioned Henry for certain other parts, paying him for the bells, lead, etc., according to their value. They wanted to save the steeple with its bells, the vestry with all the "right up aisle" to the transept, with "the monks' lodgings builded on the south aisle," the chapel of St. Margaret, "the choir and our lady's chapel with all the whole work as it standeth." Also "the whole chapel of Becket, standing in the midst of the town, with two little bells there hanging to give warning to the people of every chance of fire or other sudden business happening." Although the people had paid the king, their good intention was frustrated. The lead was torn off and the stone carried away from the south aisle and lady chapel. "The choir being demolished the inhabitants were obliged to pull the whole down and new built the present S. aisle."

* One or two instances of this may be given here. From the priory of Bridlington the duke of Norfolk took everything, plate, vestments, cattle, etc., and none of these are in the accounts (R. O. Crum. Corr., xxxiii., 39). In one year the receiver of Yorkshire, Leonard Beckwith, paid £8,200 coming from the dissolved monasteries for the fortifications of Berwick. This large sum does not come into the Augmentation office accounts (R. O. Exch. Augt. Off. Treas. Roll, ii., m. 7). Other sums paid for the same purpose at another time are £666 13s. 4d. (*Ibid.*, Mins. Acts., 32-33 Hen. VIII., 211, m. 8), and £570 (*Ibid.*, 239). From the receipts of the Somerset dissolved monasteries in the same year £1,200 was

here represent only the actual receipts of the treasurer of the Court of Augmentation and those of the keeper of the royal jewels. The amount received from rents coming from the confiscated lands and from the sale of them has already been stated, as well as the value of the gold and silver plate taken by the royal commissioners during Henry's reign. The only other regular item of receipt which calls for notice here is that which represents the proceeds of the various sales of vestments, lead, bells, furniture, glass and building material of every kind, and from all of these only £26,502 1s. 0 $\frac{1}{4}$ d. is acknowledged by the Court of Augmentation. It is possible that the proceeds of some of the sales are entered under the heading of revenue by the particular receiver of a county; but even were the sum double it would be but a paltry amount to represent the result of such wholesale pillage and destruction and as a set-off against all the misery inflicted upon the religious and the poor.

In round figures, the money received by Henry from the entire work, from 1536 till his death, was £1,338,500. To this must be added £85,000, the melting value of the plate as before stated, so that £1,423,500, or between fourteen and fifteen millions sterling of the present money, was the actual cash value to the king of the work of dissolution. Besides

“paid to the master of the works at Portland and Weymouth for the mole, fortifications and other new works” (*Ibid.*, 219, m. 16d.).

this, of course there was the worth of the vestments and other ecclesiastical furniture reserved for the king's use, and what Crumwell seemed to take more account of than even of the plate itself, the countless precious stones and jewels from all the churches in England.* What the money value of these was it is of course impossible to guess. What became of the sums Henry actually obtained will be briefly told in the first pages of the next chapter.

* It is much to be desired that the magnificent inventories of the plate, jewels and household stuff in the royal palaces and treasure house at the date of Henry's death should appear in print. It is true the MSS. (now among the Harleian collection and at the Society of Antiquaries) are voluminous. But a French Society has been found to print sumptuously the not less extensive "Mobilier de la Couronne sous Louis XIV.," and a zealous editor has not been wanting. Our English documents are of vastly greater interest, historical, artistic, antiquarian, social; and in view of the character of more than one series of thick volumes of mediocre and restricted interest issued of late by our publishing societies, the regret is all the more keen that some one of them has not summoned up courage to print a piece of such capital importance in its kind, and that a kind the value of which is now generally acknowledged.

CHAPTER XI.

THE SPENDING OF THE SPOILS—THE EJECTED MONKS AND THEIR PENSIONS.

THE wealth amassed by the plunder of churches, monasteries, colleges and hospitals was quickly dissipated. It would serve no purpose to inquire too minutely into the history of its disappearance or to explore with any very scrupulous care the various channels by which the riches, which for some years came pouring into the royal exchequer, were as quickly carried off leaving the king as needy and as great a burden upon his subjects as before.* Much of the spoil melted away so quickly that it would be impossible to account for its disappearance. One thing is, however, quite clear from the accounts of the Augmentation Office, that, whatever large sums were spent upon coast-defences and in preparation for possible foreign wars, the greater portion passed out of the royal possession without serving any public

* It has been pointed out as singular that Henry's attacks upon ecclesiastical property occurred in regular intervals of about five years. In 1530 he imposed an enormous fine on the clergy; in 1535 he commenced to dissolve the lesser monasteries; in 1540 he completed the dissolution of the larger houses; and in 1545 he attacked the universities and chantry chapels (see Blunt, "Hist. of Reformation," p. 293 *note*).

purpose. Lord Coke, in his fourth Institute, lays stress upon the fact that, "ad faciendum populum," the lesser monasteries were granted to Henry to use according "to the pleasure of Almighty God and the honour and profit of the realm," and, noticing the two statutes legalizing monastic suppressions, he observes that, amongst other promises, "the members of both Houses had been informed in parliament" that the "monasteries should never in time to come be converted to private use, and the subject never again be charged with subsidies, fifteenths, loans or other common aids." How utterly this was ignored it is needless to point out, for, says the same high authority, "since the dissolution of the monasteries," the king "has exacted divers loans and received the same against law."

Before stating briefly the chief ways in which the monastic property disappeared, one word must be said as to the second act of Parliament dealing with it. It has been before pointed out that the action of the royal agents in regard to the greater monasteries was not strictly legal, and when all opposition to Henry's policy had been defeated a measure was introduced by which all the devastation, desecration and plundering of the previous years was legalized.* The object of the act passed through parliament, which commenced on April 28th, 1539, was not to dissolve monasteries, but to secure to the king the property of those which "by any means had come

* 31 Hen. VIII., c. 13.

into his hands by supercession, dissolution or surrender since the 4th of February," 1536. The bill was introduced by the chancellor on the 13th May. On Friday, the 16th, the house having adjourned over convocation and the feast of the Ascension, in the presence of twenty abbots, the bill was read the second time, and the following Monday, May 19th it passed into law.* Unlike the act of 1536, this one does not allege any reasons for its action, but simply states that "sundry abbots, priors, abbesses, prioresses and other ecclesiastical governors and governesses of divers monasteries . . . of their own free and voluntary minds, good wills and assents, without constraint, co-action or compulsion of any manner of person or persons," have resigned their houses into Henry's hands, and therefore the king and his heirs are to hold them for ever. And this permission was to extend to all houses afterwards to be surrendered or dissolved.

Although in the words of the act itself there does not appear any considerations urged upon the parliament to induce them to grant what the king desired, it would seem quite clear that many inducements were placed before them. "And now," writes Dugdale in his "History of Warwickshire," "when all this (*i.e.*, the dissolution) was effected, to the end it might not be thought that these things

* Lord's Journals (B. Mus. Coll. MS., Tib., D. i., f. 58). In the parliament which assembled for its second session on April 12th, 1540, a note says, "No abbots present."

were done with a high hand, the king having protested that he would suppress none without the consent of his parliament (it being called April 28, 1539, to confirm the surrenders so made) there wanted not plausible insinuations to both houses, for drawing on their consent with all smoothness thereunto: the nobility being promised large shares in the spoil; either by free gift from the king, easy purchases, or most advantageous exchanges; and many of the active gentry advancement to honours, with increase of their estates: all which we see happened to them accordingly. And the better to satisfy the vulgar, it was represented to them that by this deluge of wealth the kingdom would be strengthened with an army of forty thousand men, and that for the future they should never be charged with subsidies, fifteenths, loans or common aids. By which means, the parliament ratifying the above surrenders, the work became completed.”*

That some promises of this nature were actually made is more than probable. What is apparently the preamble of a projected act drawn up at this time, and having direct reference to the dissolution of the great monasteries, exists. The document is written and corrected by Henry himself, and proposes to take the revenues of the monasteries to establish

* Within a year a loan was again asked and granted. “In a parliament which began the 18 of April (1540) was granted to the king a subsidy of 2s. the pound lands and 12d. goods and four fifteens towards the king’s great charges in building of block-houses” (Stow’s “Flores,” 974).

schools, almshouses and new bishops' sees. It was withdrawn, as Tanner believed, "when the bill for the suppression was actually passed."*

Some portion of the confiscated property, although only a very small portion, found its way back to the church. Six new bishoprics were created out of the ruins of the monastic houses, at Westminster, Oxford, Chester, Gloucester, Bristol, and Peter-

* The projected act in Henry's writing is in the Cotton MSS. Cleop., E. iv., f. 305. The following portion is printed in Wright, p. 262 :—"Forasmuch as it is not unknown the slothful and ungodly life which hath been used amongst all sort which have borne the name of religious folk, and to the intent that henceforth many of them might be turned to better use (as hereafter shall follow), whereby God's word might the better be set forth, children brought up in learning, clerics nourished in the universities, old servants decayed have livings, almshouses for poor folk to be sustained in, readers of Greek, Hebrew and Latin to have good stipends, daily alms to be ministered, mending of highways, exhibitions for ministers of the Church, it is thought therefore unto the king's highness most expedient and necessary that more bishopricks, collegiate and cathedral churches should be established instead of these foresaid religious houses, within the foundation whereof other titles before rehearsed shall be established."

On a second sheet of paper is another document written by the king, but apparently incomplete :—

"Bishopricks to be new made."

Essex	Waltham.	
Hertford	St. Albans.	
Bedfordshire and Bucks	}	
						Dunstable,
						Newenham,
					Elneſtowe.	
Oxford and Berks	Osney and Thame.	
Northampton and Huntingdon	Peterbro'.	
Middlesex	Westminster.	
Leicester and Rutland	Leicester.	
Gloucestershire	St. Peter's (Gloucester).	

borough, and the endowments for the bishops and chapters had been calculated at about £100,000 of modern money.* Besides this, some small sums were paid to educational purposes at Oxford and Cambridge, but beyond these comparatively insignificant amounts the whole sum realized by the dissolutions was spent for secular and private purposes, and even the tithes of parishes, which had been appropriated to the religious houses, passed away by grant or purchase from the royal appropriator to lay

Lancashire	Fountains and Archdeaconry of Richmond.
Suffolk	Bury.
Stafford and Salop	Shrewsbury.
Notts and Derby	Welbeck, Worksop and Thurgarton.
Cornwall	Launceston, Bodmin with another.

“ Places to be altered according to our device which have sees in them.”

Christ Church in Canterbury.
St. Swithun's (Winchester).
Ely, Durham, Rochester.
Worcester and all others having the same.

“ Places to be altered into colleges and schools only.”

Burton super Trent.

* In 1541, John Chambers, last abbot of Peterborough, was made first bishop. About the same time Thomas Thirlby became first and only bishop of Westminster, and Robert King, late abbot of Osney, was made bishop of Oxfordshire, with Osney abbey church as his cathedral. Shortly after the see was moved to Christchurch, Oxford. Paul Bush became first bishop of Bristol, John Wakeman of Gloucester and Richard Sampson of Chester, all about the same time. Seven other cathedrals hitherto served by Benedictines were occupied by secular canons, many of the monks, however, obtaining stalls in the new foundation. These were Canterbury, Durham, Winchester, Ely, Carlisle, Norwich and Worcester.

owners to be henceforth used by them as part of their general revenue.*

The way in which a great deal of the monastic property was got rid of by the king is notorious. Fuller describes how "not only cooks, but the meanest turn-broach in the king's kitchen did lick his fingers," and he gives on good authority instances of Henry's prodigality with the abbey lands. Estates of considerable value were parted with readily as gifts to those who won his favour. "I could add," says the historian, "how he gave a religious house of some value to mistress — for presenting him with a dish of puddings which pleased his palate."†

* With regard to Henry's gifts to Oxford and Cambridge the following is of interest:—

Money appointed to be paid towards the dotation and erection of colleges at Oxford and Cambridge from 25 March anno 36° to Michaelmas anno 38°

The revenues of Osney to			
Oxford	£702 9 4 $\frac{3}{4}$
By warrant to Treasurer	£2400 0 0
To Cambridge revenues of			
King's Hall and Michael-	£329 15 8
house	£329 15 8
By warrant	£2000 0 0

After paying the ordinary "wages and stipend" there remained for building purposes at Oxford £1,617 18s. 1 $\frac{3}{4}$ d., and at Cambridge £971 7s. (R. O. Exch. Aug. Off. Misc. Bk., 415, f. 108).

The last year of Henry's reign, however, the revenues were not paid, and the college of Christchurch, Oxford, was in debt. Edward VI., to meet this, paid Dr. Coxe, the dean, £2,400 (*Ibid.*, Treas. Roll, iii., m. 201).

† Much the same story is told by a writer of about the year 1557 (B. Mus. Arund. MS., 151, f. 387). In this version a cook who pleased the king with a well-cooked sucking pig had as his reward

In the same way Fuller states that Henry lost a great deal by play. "Once, being at dice," he writes, "he played Sir Miles Partridge (staking a hundred pounds against them) for Jesus' bells, hanging in a steeple not far from St. Paul's in London, and as great and tunable as any in the city, and lost them at a cast."*

How the king was robbed by all connected with the work of spoliation has frequently been illustrated in these pages. The inquiry made by queen Elizabeth, and the information presented to her, evidently by an authority on the matter, leave no doubt that the king was cheated out of a very large portion of the plunder by the officials he employed.

How the rest went is shown on the rolls of the Treasurer of the Augmentation or the accounts of the keeper of the royal jewels.† It is only fair in the first place to point out that a large proportion of the plunder went for national purposes. To fortify the coasts, to establish a fleet, to support Henry's foreign policy, and to collect and maintain his armies the "the college of St. Edmund, Salisbury, with certain rectories," and thus, says the old writer, was given to a layman to whom it could not belong "the cure of souls."

* This story is also given (*Ibid.*), but with a slight change. Miles Partridge is represented as a gambler who had lost everything, and Henry gave him the belfry bells and lead to retrieve his fortune with. The writer adds that Partridge was afterwards hanged.

† It would be impossible to give full details without copious notes. The general sources of expenditure found in the Appendix are taken from the Treasurer's Rolls.

ecclesiastical spoils were freely used. Thus, of the £1,338,500 actually acknowledged as received by the Augmentation Office from the beginning of the work of suppression till Henry's death, about £64,500 went to coast fortifications, £28,000 for naval matters, £137,000 for purposes of foreign war, including the defence of Calais and other towns on the continent, and very nearly half-a-million of money upon the general military affairs of the nation, about one-half that sum being expended on the purchase and manufacture of guns, to which also the metal of a large number of the monastery bells was devoted. It may be, therefore, allowed that more than half the money received by the Augmentation Office for the plunder was expended on public purposes.

Of the rest a large sum was expended upon the royal palaces at Westminster, Hampton Court, Chelsea, Hackney, St. James' and elsewhere, as well as upon enclosing the king's parks and adapting some of the old abbey buildings to the royal requirements. Nearly £52,000 was spent upon the purchase of lands, £23,000 on the household expenses of the young prince Edward and £274,086 19s 8 $\frac{3}{4}$ d. was either paid to the king in cash or went to support his household. Such are the chief channels which quickly carried off the wealth obtained from the destruction of the monastic houses.

The accounts of the keeper of royal jewels show that about £10,000 was spent on coast fortifications and nearly the same sum was sent, for the king's

purposes, to Ireland. Of the plate itself, a great deal was either handed to Henry for his use, or other gold and silver articles were purchased for him with the proceeds. In this account and on the treasurer's rolls no less than £30,860 was entered under this heading, as well as more than half the entire value of the plate obtained by the spoilers, that is £46,636 1s. 1¼d., was given over "to the proper hand" of the king.*

Something must now be said about the pensions which were paid to the disbanded monks and nuns out of the funds coming into the king's possession on the dissolution of their houses. At the outset it is well to state that there is every reason to suppose the promised annuities were fairly well and punctually paid, at least during the reign of Henry VIII. Still, it is necessary to bear in mind that by no means all the religious, who were deprived of their homes and turned out into the world to begin life afresh, were provided with any pittance whatever to secure them against poverty, or even, it is to be feared in many cases, absolute starvation. In the first place, upon the dissolution of the monasteries which possessed an income of under £200 a year, the superiors only were granted a pension. By the terms of the Act of Parliament passed in February, 1536, the king's "majesty is pleased and contented, of his most excellent charity, to provide

* *Monastic Treasures*, Abbotsford Club, p. 93. For further particulars see Appendix.

to every chief head and governor of every such religious house" a yearly pension for life. As for the community, "his majesty will ordain and provide that the convents of every such religious house shall have their capacities, if they will, to live honestly and virtuously abroad and some convenient charity disposed to them toward their living, or else shall be committed to such honourable great monasteries of this realm wherein good religion is observed, as shall be limited by his highness there to live religiously during their lives."*

But although many of the monks and nuns thus disbanded found homes for a time in other houses of their order, it is probable that the majority were forced to take the alternative offered them and accept Henry's dispensation to seek their living in the world. Thus, as an example, William Morland, a monk of Louth Park, whose name is connected with the Lincolnshire rising, declares that when he went to Bourne abbey to obtain his "capacities" "a late canon of Bourne, then also suppressed," gave him six-and-twenty other dispensations to distribute † to his fellow monks.

To those who thus went out into the world it is certain that the king never extended the promised "convenient charity disposed to them toward their living." In most instances only the abbot or superior received anything. In a few cases the religious obtained a few pounds or generally shillings

* 27 Hen. VIII., cap. 28. † R. O. Chapt. H. Bk., A. $\frac{2}{20}$, p. 96.

on quitting their cloisters. Thus at Louth Park the abbot, George Walker, was granted a pension of £20 a year, but none of his ten monks apparently received anything whatever.* At Bourne in the same way John Small, the abbot, was allowed £24 a year, but none of his ten canons received anything on the dissolution of their house.† Other communities were somewhat more fortunate. Thus the five nuns of Cannington convent, in Somerset, received twenty shillings each on their dismissal, and Cecilia Verney, their prioress, was pensioned.‡ The seven Cistercians of Buildwas, in Shropshire, had fifty-five shillings divided between them.§ And, to take but one more example, at Cleeve abbey, in Somerset, the abbot was pensioned, the prior had a present of £4 3s. 10d., and each of the thirteen other monks went out of their cloister with twenty-six and eightpence in their purses.||

In no known instance among the early dissolutions was any entire community pensioned; and, with only one or two exceptions, where subsequently an individual member obtained a grant, was provision made for anyone but the superior. In fact, the list of grants made during the period of these suppressions shows that not above 204 monks, canons and nuns out of the entire number of those dismissed had any pension assigned to them.¶ As this number

* R. O. Exch. Augt. Off. Mins. Accts., 27-28 Hen. VIII., 81.

† *Ibid.*, 166. ‡ *Ibid.*, 169, m. 2. § *Ibid.*, 165, m. 2.

|| *Ibid.*, 169, m. 2d.

¶ R. O. Augt. Off. Misc. Bk. 244, Original of Grants; also *Ibid.*

amounted to at least 2000 it is obvious that a very small fraction only of those whose property was confiscated continued to be chargeable upon it or to interfere with Henry's full enjoyment or free disposal of the Church lands so obtained.

Even the case of the religious who elected, under the provisions of the act of dissolution, to be transferred to other monasteries, was scarcely more fortunate. For a year or two they were, perhaps, spared the hard fate of their brethren who had passed at once into the world, but in the end the same lot befell them. The conditions upon which general pensions were subsequently granted to the members of a community would seem to exclude these new comers from participation in the benefit. Each individual grant provided that the recipient of the royal favour must have been for a considerable time (*diu antea*) before the dissolution an inmate of the monastery. While a comparison of the pension list of a monastery with any previous records of the names of the community* will certainly bear out the view that as a general rule only professed members of a house were made chargeable upon its revenues.†

Bk. 232, "Enrolment of Grants." The pension was only paid to those who had a "patent" from the king, and many instances can be given of payment being refused when the letters patent were not forthcoming.

* *e.g.*, the lists of monks contained in the Augmentation Office-Book, 245, with the acknowledgments of royal supremacy printed in Dep. Keeper's Rept., vii.

† Under the act dissolving the lesser monasteries more than two-thirds of the Cistercian houses were suppressed. The inmates were,

Even in the suppressions which took place afterwards, and not by virtue of the act dissolving the lesser houses, by no means all the disbanded religious were provided with pensions. The friars, as a class, received no yearly allowance. Only in the case of one or two individuals does there appear

as a rule, transferred to other greater houses of the Order (Mr. Baigent's "Abbey of Waverley," p. 46). On the dissolution of Netley in February, 1537, all the monks went back to their mother house at Beaulieu. In the early part of March, 1536, John Browning, the abbot of Beaulieu, died, and Thomas Stephens, then abbot of Netley, was elected his successor. This was no sooner done than Netley was suppressed and all the Netley monks accompanied their abbot to Beaulieu. On April 2, 1538, this abbot and 20 monks signed the surrender of Beaulieu. In February, 1540, abbot Stephens was instituted to the rectory of Bentworth, near Alton, vacant at that time by reason of the deprivation of John Palmes. This latter was most unwilling to submit, and on March 1st (1540) wrote a letter of complaint to Crumwell saying that "his cousin Cooke, with gentlemen and farmers of Sir John Wallop's tenants assembled upon St. Mathias' even (February 23) last past and inducted as parson of Bentworth, the abbot quondam of Beaulieu, and with great violence and blows given entered into the parsonage and sealed up the barn doors, and hired men, with money, to gangle and ring the bells above all measure and custom of a charitable induction, where of great clamour and wonder is of men in the whole shire, so that my name and estimation is clean gone and destroyed in all this disturbance at Bentworth." In 1548 Thomas Stephens was collated to the treasurership of Salisbury Cathedral and died in 1550, holding both these preferments (Mr. Baigent's MSS. Collections). It may be here noted that indications of disbanded religious obtaining livings are only by chance lighted upon. In the registers abbot Stephens, for example, is called "T. Stephens, *capellanus*," and in 1548 he is "Mr. Thomas Stephyns, *infirmus*." This is an instance of the difficulty experienced in tracing the expelled religious.

any exception. Thus the superiors of some of the London friaries obtained small grants, as £10 to John Gibbs, prior of the Carmelites; £13 6s. 8d. to Thomas Chapman, prior of the Franciscans; £60 to John Hilsey, bishop of Rochester, and commendatory superior of the Dominicans, and five marks to Ralph Turnor, of Crutched friars.* These, with the superiors of the Franciscan and Dominican convents in York, were very nearly the only members of the four orders of friars who were granted any pensions whatever. The rest were dismissed from their houses with some small gratuity, generally only a few shillings, and left to provide for themselves. Thus, when the Carmelites of North Allerton were disbanded, two days before the feast of Christmas, 1538, William Humfrey, the prior, was given six shillings and eightpence, four of his brethren five shillings, and six of the younger members three and fourpence apiece, and this, as the record has it, was paid by the special "consideration of the commissioner."†

In the same way, when on November 21st, 1538, the Franciscans of Doncaster were dismissed, sixty shillings was distributed amongst them "out of the abundant benevolence of the lord king," who, at the same time, relieved them of their house, the vestments and other ornaments of their church, as well as three chalices and two cruets of silver. It was

* R. O. Exch. Augt. Off. Misc. Bk., 233. "Enrolments of Grants, annis 30^o-31^o," ff. 161, 163, 146.

† *Ibid.*, Mins. Accts, 29-30 Hen. VIII., 197, m. 12d.

calculated also by his agent that there were 44 foddors of lead upon the roofs of the monastic buildings and four bells which would be worth some £200 to sell.* Even these were more fortunate than some others, who, like the Trinitarians of Newcastle, were ejected without any "reward," and the prior left to pay the convent's debts with what he could collect out of money due to the house.†

As a rule, therefore, it may be taken for granted that no pension whatever was allotted to any of the friars. The whole number, at the lowest estimate some eighteen hundred, were cast adrift in the world and left to find a living as best they might. Even those who were priests experienced great difficulties in obtaining clerical employment, as it has been before stated. The lot of those not in sacred orders must have been harder still.

With respect to the rest of the great body of monks and nuns who were pensioned, their grants were obtained by compliance with the king's wishes. Those that resigned their houses at the royal invitation were promised annuities. Those that resisted every suggestion of "voluntary surrender" got nothing and acquired for themselves the deadly animosity of a king, who would take no contradiction. "If they," runs the instructions to the royal commissioners, shall willingly consent and agree "to the proposed suppression" the said commissioners shall appoint unto the said head and every of their convent

* *Ibid.*, mm. 2d. 3.

† *Ibid.*, m. 15.

pensions for (the) term of their lives. But "if they shall find any of the said heads and convents so appointed to be dissolved so wilful and obstinate that they will in no wise submit themselves to the king's majesty," then they shall take possession of everything by force. "But they shall in no wise assign any pensions . . . to any such obstinate and wilful persons till they shall know further of the king's pleasure."*

To many of the monks, no doubt, the alternative here expressed in the royal instructions was clear, and they elected to go out with a pension, rather than be turned out with nothing to secure them against absolute starvation. Others preferred even death to the dishonour of betraying a trust which they had for the Church and the poor; and, to use Dr. Hillyard's words to the prior of Mountgrace, they held "that it was a manner of selling the house to surrender up their house for money or pensions."† The resistance of the prioress of Ambresbury to the suggestions of the king's agents has already been related. She preferred to go out and beg her bread rather than take a pension for a surrender. Her successor, Joan Darrell, put into the office for the purpose of giving up the convent, obtained £100 a year for her compliance. The name of the brave Florence Bannerman does not appear upon the

* R. O. Chapter House Bk., A. $\frac{4}{36}$. This document has been quoted more at length in a previous chapter.

† R. O. State Papers, Dom., 1538, $\frac{v}{11}$.

pension roll of the house, and she was, no doubt, left to carry out her design of begging for her support. It would be difficult to suppose that there were not many others in the English houses at the time possessed of a similar spirit, whilst the recorded pensions prove that of the entire number of religious at that time in England not one half were given any annuity whatever.*

A large number of those not pensioned have already been accounted for, and to these must be added the members of all houses which were made to fall into the king's hands by the attainder of the superior. Thus no monk at monasteries such as Kirksted, Jervaulx or Whalley in the northern parts, and Glastonbury, Reading, Colchester or Woburn in the south obtained anything. Moreover, even a surrender does not appear to have furnished an absolute title to such a reward. Thus, to give one example, Furness abbey, the surrender of which has been related, was dissolved apparently without the monks having any promise of pension, and no grant is found enrolled in the Augmentation Court. On dismissal, each of them received only forty shillings

* The total number of patents for religious pensions enrolled in the Augmentation Office books is under 4,000. Without this patent no pension was paid, and it may, therefore, be presumed that this number is fairly correct. According to a previous estimate there were some 8,081 religious of all orders at the time of the suppression in England. The enrolled grants found in the Record Office, Exch. Augt. Off. Misc. Bk., No. 232, Part I., contains those granted anno 28^o; Part II., those in 29^o and 30^o; No. 233, those in 30^o-31^o; and Nos. 234-5, those in 31^o-32^o.

except three, "who were sick and impotent," to whom an extra twenty shillings was granted. The following year, however, the abbot was provided with the profits of the rectory of Dalton, valued at £33 6s. 8d. per annum, which may have been given him in lieu of pension, but, as far as is known, none of the thirty monks who composed his community obtained anything for their compliance with the royal demands.

The amount of the pensions varied considerably. Some of the abbots appear to have had large payments for those days. Thus John Lawrence de Wardeboys, the last abbot of Ramsey, had a grant of £266 13s. 4d. a year with a house, woods and swans for life.* Abbot Wardeboys, however, who had been appointed to the office in 1507, was a very old man at the time of the surrender and was not likely to draw the pension very long, and he had not only very readily resigned his trust when called upon, but had been, it is said, busy in persuading other abbots to follow his example. Even larger was the pension given to the late abbot of Bermondsey, Robert Wharton, who since 1536 had been bishop of St. Asaphs, a sum of £333 6s. 8d. being assigned him out of the revenues of the monastery. Some other bishops, who were commendatory abbots, received large sums, as the bishop of Down in Ireland, by royal letters patent abbot of Thorney, John Draper, a suffragan and

* R. O. Exch. Off. Misc. Bk., 245, f. 64.

prior of Twynham, Christchurch, and several others.

The ordinary pension, however, for the superior of one of the large monasteries appears to have been about £100 a year, and the average grant to each religious between £5 and £6. In the case of smaller houses the pension was proportionally less, and in some cases the superior did not receive more than £15 or even £10. Of the convents, Syon was the most highly paid. Agnes Jordan, the abbess, received no less a sum than £200 a year, while none of her sisters had less than £6, and several more than that sum. Very few of the nuns, however, had anything like that amount; £40 being the ordinary pension for an abbess and £3 or £4, and very often less, for a nun. In some places lay sisters and novices were not allowed to be entered on the pension list, possibly because they could have had no part in resigning the house.

Sometimes, as in the case of the abbot of Ramsey just quoted, besides the actual grant of money the pensioner was allowed certain houses, lands or privileges. Thus the abbot of Ford had the use of a house and grounds, the prior of Bath had "appointed to him for his dwelling house one tenement set and lying in Stall street within the Southgate of Bath,"* and the abbot of Winchcombe was allowed to cut yearly 40 loads of firewood out of

* *Ibid.*, f. 109. "Wherein one Jeffry Stainer lately dwelled being of the yearly rent of 20/."

“Deepwood” thicket. To others, members of old monastic churches or cathedrals, an office in the new establishment, over and above a small pension, was given. Thus, at Rochester, Thomas Grey had forty shillings a year “besides the office of Gospeller” and Thomas Cope the same amount and “the office of Epistoler.”* At Ely, in the same way, three monks, noted to be “good choir men,” received an office as well as a pension of £8 a year.† In certain other cases a living or cure of souls was granted in lieu of a pension. Thus, to give one or two examples, at Missenden, in Buckinghamshire, Thomas Barnard obtained the vicarage of the abbey, and another, John Slythurst, became curate of Lee with a pension of £8; at Pulton, in Wiltshire, John Hogge was appointed by Petre, the royal commissioner, “to serve the cure there and for his wages” to have 106s. 8d., “and if he were unable to serve then forty shillings.”‡ One other example from the neighbouring county of Dorset is worth recording: at Bindon, one of the monks obtained “the cure” of the place and for his services he was to get yearly £6 13s. 4d., “and the king to have all manner of tithes and oblations.”§

* *Ibid.*, f. 76.† *Ibid.*, f. 61.‡ *Ibid.*, f. 122.

§ *Ibid.*, f. 145. Instances of cures being served by religious prior to the dissolution are sometimes met with. Thus the abbot of Quare, William Repon, was instituted to the vicarage of Carisbrooke, Isle of Wight, in 1533. On 24 February, 1536, on the dissolution of the abbey, he was called *capellanus*, and instituted to the vicarage of Newchurch on the presentation of Sir Richard Lyster, kt. He re-

If some of the promised pensions appear somewhat high there was a reason for this, especially in the beginning of the work of suppression. From Coventry, Dr. London wrote about the Benedictine house, that the prior had been in office only a very short time. "He is," he continues, "a sad honest priest as his neighbours do report him, and (he) is a bachelor of divinity. He gave his house unto the king's grace willingly and so in like manner did all his brethren." After declaring what pensions he had promised, the commissioner concludes: "Beseeching your good mastership to confirm and authorize the same by your high authority, and thereby others perceiving that these men be liberally handled will with better will, not only surrender their houses, but also leave the same in the better state to the king's use."*

The same reason prompted Dr. London in the case of Combe abbey. Robert Bate had been signed this the following year, and was succeeded by John Austen, canon of Tichfield, then dissolved on the presentation of the abbot of Beaulieu (Mr. Baigent's MSS. Collections). This instance would seem to show that the larger monasteries gave livings to the disbanded inmates of the smaller houses. One or two more examples may be added. In 1520 Thomas London, abbot of Quare, was vicar of Carisbrooke, and one of his monks was serving curate at Binsted. In 1532 Lainston, near Winchester, was served by a Carmelite friar. Littleton was always served by a monk of St. Swithun's priory, and the proceeds of the cure went to purchase books for the choir of his monastic church (*Ibid.*).

* R. O. Exch. Q. R. Miscellanea, 7^s, No. 15. Thomas Camswell, the prior, was granted £133 6s. 8d. a year (Augt. Off. Misc. Bk., 233, f. 118).

made abbot only "the same day twelve months" before he was invited to resign. He had, it appeared, already "paid part of his first-fruits and tenths." Dr. London assigned him £80 and hoped that Crumwell would ratify the grant, "as your mastership so doing," he writes, "will give occasion to others the more rather to make like surrender."* The same visitor also thought large pensions were deserved by those who so short a time previously had redeemed their houses by large money payments to the king, who had under his great seal granted that they should continue for ever. Thus he urges that the Carthusians of Coventry, the nuns of Delapre, the Austin canons of Ulvescroft and others who had "lately obtained the king's grace's charter for the continuance of the same to their and their friends great charge"† might reasonably hope for good pensions.

Not every royal commissioner, however, cared to plead for generous pensions. It was naturally to the interest of the king's officials to reduce obligations on the received estates as much as possible, and much bargaining, no doubt, was resorted to to make the conditions upon which surrender would be made as easy as possible. Thus Robert Southwell, one of these officials, writing of St. James's abbey, Northampton, to Crumwell says: "We have practised with the poor men for their pensions as easily to the king's charge and as much to his grace's honour as we could devise."‡

* *Ibid.*, Augt. Off. Misc. Bk., 245, f. 42.

† *Ibid.*, ff. 36, 38, 39.

‡ Wright, p. 173.

It has already been stated that the promised pensions were, as far as can be ascertained, fairly well paid. The disbanded religious received their annuities either directly from the Court of Augmentation in London, or from the royal receiver, appointed to administer the estates coming from the religious houses, in any particular county. It is difficult to understand the reason of the distinction, especially when some members of a house were paid by the office in London and others by the particular receiver of the county. Some religious, especially in the earlier dissolutions, were especially directed to receive their annuities in London,* and as in process of time the various lands diminished by royal grants or sales, and receipts from them dwindled in proportion, the number of monks and nuns paid by the general treasurer in London increased.

Thus, in the first two years after the creation of the Augmentation Office only seventeen individuals drew their annuities directly from the treasurer in London, and in the last years of Henry's reign more than 200 monks and nuns were paid by him at the London office.† The great bulk of the pensioners, however, continued to draw their allowances from

* Thus at Fosse, in Lincolnshire, Dr. London promised the nuns a pension, and added, "All are to come to London for them" (R. O. Exch. Augt. Off. Misc. Bk., 245, f. 23). They were, however, paid subsequently by the Lincolnshire receiver.

† Payments made by the office are entered on the Rolls of the Treasurer of the Court of Augmentation. The Miscellaneous Books of that Office (Nos. 246, 249, 250, 256) are the ledger books of these payments during Henry VIII.'s reign.

the king's officers in the different counties in which their monasteries had been situated.*

In the process of paying the money considerable abuses crept in. Many of the pensioned monks and nuns, either from age, infirmities or other causes, were unable to attend and receive their annuities personally, and were consequently forced to employ agents. Thus at one time a certain Anthony Emery, servant to Richard Pollard, was sent to obtain the pensions of some fifty or sixty monks and nuns of the west country. Another agent journeyed to London to fetch the money due to the abbess of Canonleigh and seventeen of her nuns, and a third acted in a like capacity for the prior of Plympton and his canons.† The necessity of sending long distances, with the reasonable costs of the requisite agents, considerably reduced the pittances already small enough; but the various charges made by the officials concerned in the disbursement of the royal bounty still further diminished the sums awarded. For each quarterly payment the official was entitled to a fee of fourpence, but in practice there is little doubt that much more was demanded.‡

* These payments appear in the Ministers' Accounts, and are shown as deducted from the receipts accounted for to the treasurer in London.

† R. O. Exch. Augt. Off. Treas. Roll, ii., m. 20d.

‡ As an example, the case of the nuns of Limbroke, in Herefordshire, may be given. They had fallen under the act for the suppression of the lesser monasteries, having an income of only £22 a year, but had purchased from Henry the perpetual continuance of their convent by a payment of £53 6s. 8d., more than double their

Further reductions were made in the pensions promised, by the amounts being subjected to deduction on account of every subsidy granted by parliament to the king. Thus in the first year after the general dissolution a tenth part of the payment was withheld, as "the first subsidy due to our sovereign-lord the king."* Two years afterwards "one-fourth part of the pensions of all the late religious persons . . . having £20 and upward" was deducted "by way of loan" to Henry, and when the half annual income (Aug. Off. Treas. Roll, i., m. 4d). At the close of 1539, however, they were called upon to surrender to the king, and the five nuns were promised pensions; the prioress £6, and each of the others 5s. 4d. In all they were to have £16 13s. 4d. a year. The following are the charges made for obtaining that sum for them:—

William Thomas to John Scudamore, enclosing a bill for getting the pensions for the "poor nuns of Limbroke."

	£	s.	d.
"First to write Mr. Chancellor's clerk for making the warrant and getting it signed"	0	6	8
"Item to Mr. Duke's clerk for writing out the pensions"	0	6	8
"Item paid to Glascocke to dispatch them from the seal"	0	5	0
"Item my lord Privy Seal's fee for the head of the house"	1	0	0
"Item Mr. Chancellor's and Mr. Duke's fees of every 'pentionary' at 11s."	2	15	0
"Item for mine owne labour"	1	0	0
Summa	5	13	4"

—(B. Mus. Add. MS., 11,041, f. 60.)

* Bib. Bod. Tanner MS., 343, f. 1, *et seq.*, contains the Scudamore accounts for four counties showing this deduction.

year was due, on March 25th, 1543, the religious only received one quarter of the annual payment.* By these two methods Henry retained from the pensions a sum of £9,443 15s. 6d. for himself.† Beyond this, he received in 1544 from the clergy, and amongst them from many of the pensioned religious, the sum of £12,870 16s. 8d. as a war contribution, but a portion of this sum was subsequently repaid.‡

Necessity compelled some at least of the disbanded religious to part with their patents, and speculators were ready enough to purchase the annuity "for little or no money, or other thing given to the said pensioners, supplanting them to their utter undoing." It was, therefore, found necessary in the third year of the reign of Edward VI. for parliament to apply some remedy to this state of things. An act was consequently passed ordering all persons who had obtained pension patents in any fraudulent manner to restore them within six months. They were to receive back whatever they had originally paid, and if they failed to deliver the grant it was to be forfeited and all future payment made to the original owner. At the same time the officers and receivers were commanded to pay all pensions upon reasonable request under a penalty of £5, and

* B. Mus. Harl. MS., 604, f. 108.

† R. O. Exch. Augt. Off. Treas. Roll, ii., mm. 45-48.

‡ *Ibid.*, Roll ii., m. 32. Amongst the names of those contributing are: The late abbot of York, £100; ditto of Evesham, £66 13s. 4d.; ditto of Hayles, £66 13s. 4d., and others.

if they demanded more than their legal fee they were to forfeit ten times the amount taken.*

A subsequent examination was made by a commission appointed to inquire into the pensions paid in each county. From the report of the officials, which still exists for some counties, many interesting particulars are learnt about the monks' pensions.† Many of the religious did not appear to claim their annuity. Many were proved to have died, and others had not been paid for the past year or so. Of a great many, who ought to have been in receipt of a pension, no tidings could be learnt, and in a good number of instances the original owner had long before parted with the grant. Thus, to give one or two examples of these sales, Laurence Sterkbone, a religious of Worksop, took £10 13s. 4d. for his annuity of £5 6s. 8d. from the bailiff of the town, who nine months later sold it again to one William Bolles for £16. The original pensioner, Laurence Sterkbone, had only received his annuity for a couple of years, when he sold it at little more than two years' purchase. Another canon of the same monastery had got rid of his grant of £4 on somewhat better terms—for £12.‡

Of Bury St. Edmunds the commissioners mention that one "Thomas Cole, about eight or nine years

* 2 and 3 Ed. VI., cap. 7.

† R. O. Chapter House, Box: 154, Nos. 2, 15, 25, 54, 61, 63, 64.

‡ *Ibid.*, No. 25.

ago, did give and assign over his annuity to Ambrose Jermyn, Esq., upon condition that the said Ambrose did procure and obtain for him the benefice of Flempton, in Suffolk, of the gift of one Thomas Lucas, Esq." Another former monk, "Thomas Rowte, upon his oath saith and thereupon showeth an indenture bearing date the 1st day of March, in the thirty-sixth year of Henry VIII., declaring that he then sold and assigned over his letters patent to one Ralph Cockerell for the sum of £26 13s. 4d., whereof he saith he never received but only £19."*

These instances of the sales of pensions are only examples of others to be found in the same report, and they would almost certainly have been found to be much more numerous had it not been for the act of parliament passed a year or two before which made the possession of purchased grants illegal. As it was, the receivers had clearly been ordered to refuse payment to all but the original owners.

A brief answer must now be given to a question so often asked: "What became of the ejected religious?" At the outset it must be confessed that the information available on this point is so meagre that no satisfactory reply can be given. Turned out of their houses, the monks and nuns, especially those to whom no pensions were assigned, must have endured great suffering and undergone many privations in their endeavours to gain a livelihood. This much can be certainly said without in

* *Ibid.*, No. 15.

any way exaggerating the hardship of their lot. But hardly any detail of the subsequent lives of those ejected from the dismantled cloisters of England is known to exist. The muse of history has perhaps mercifully spared the world what would have been a picture of deep distress and misery.

Some of those who were priests (and most of the monks, canons and friars appear to have been in sacred orders) would no doubt have been provided with livings. It was obviously to the advantage of the crown that a pensioned priest should be presented to a living as quickly as might be, since every annuity was granted only until some ecclesiastical benefice, of suitable money value, should be found for the holder. Still, the pension lists do not show that this was carried out to any great extent, and the fact that the royal policy in religious matters tended considerably to diminish the call for priests, would render it more difficult to obtain any preferment of this kind for the disbanded monks. The great falling off in candidates for sacred orders at this time would have been more than counterbalanced by the diminution of possible cures. Some small proportion, however, of the monks and friars clearly found occupation and a livelihood in congenial clerical occupations.*

* A few of the most compliant abbots were provided with bishoprics during the schism. Thus Salcot, of Hyde, became bishop of Bangor and subsequently of Salisbury. Thomas Spark, a monk of Durham, was given the see of Berwick; Wharton, of Bermondsey, had St. Asaph's; Rugg, of Hulme, Norwich; Holbeach,

Even to obtain a living formalities had to be gone through which must have been often impossible and have frequently debarred others from undertaking the task. The peculiar hardship of a friar's position in this respect has been remarked upon in a previous chapter. And, although it is impossible to blame a bishop's care in preventing the chance of profanation from pretended orders, it is no less difficult to contemplate without shame the miserable spectacle of Englishmen, by education and episcopal consecration ordained for the service of the sanctuary, driven by want to beg that they might be put "into one of the priest's offices for a piece of bread."

The eagerness with which a "capacity," or permission to take a living, or other cure, was sought after is illustrated in a curious way. In the ordinary course it was necessary first to prove the reception of orders, next to obtain a dispensation from the archbishop of Canterbury to leave the cloister, to put off the religious habit, and to undertake the care of souls, and thirdly, to obtain the king's confirmation of this dispensation.* Whether this was

prior of Worcester, the new see of Bristol; abbot Chambers, the new see of Peterborough; Kitchen, that of Llandaff; Wakeman, of Tewkesbury, became first bishop of Gloucester, and John Salisbury, prior of St. Faith's, was made the new suffragan of Thetford.

* The archbishop's dispensation and king Henry's confirmation in the case of the abbot of Feversham are printed by Southouse, "*Monasticon Favershamiense*," pp. 136-7. The "*Archæologia*

always required is not certain, and probably the comedy was not kept up in the final suppressions. But at the time of the expulsion of the friars from their houses it appears to have been the rule. In the ordinary course, therefore, a Franciscan friar named John Young obtained from archbishop Cranmer his capacity and the "letters of dispensation" from the king to enable him to get a living when chance offered. Another friar minor, Richard Sharpe, who apparently had some difficulty in obtaining similar documents for himself, borrowed the parchments from Young, and forged a like "capacity" and "dispensation" in his own name.

Cantiana" (viii., pp. 50-58) prints several documents of great interest on this matter. A monk of Battle, one Thomas Bede Twysden, received a dispensation from Cranmer and a confirmation from Henry. He was only in deacon's orders and on being turned out of his monastery lived in the world and, amongst other things, acted as executor to the will and guardian to the children of his brother. In 1556 he obtained a dispensation and absolution for thus acting against the canons from cardinal Pole. The following year Thomas Bede Twysden petitioned for pardon for having put on a secular dress without permission of the pope, for living out of his monastery, and for dealing with property by permission only of the parliament. His petition was granted by David Pole, the cardinal's vicar general in 1557. He was allowed to receive ordination and to live in a secular priest's dress, out of a monastery "donec regularia loca restaurata fuerint;" on condition that whatever money came into his hands more than sufficient for his necessities should be devoted to pious uses or the poor, and that "bona prefata post mortem tuam præfato monasterio de Battell, vel religioni, etc., arbitrio ordinarii tui pro tempore existentis applicentur." Thomas Twysden died at Wye, near Battle, in 1584.

The forgery was discovered. Sharpe was tried at Norwich in April, 1539, and condemned to be hanged, drawn and quartered. The sentence, however, was not carried out, and he was subsequently pardoned.*

In the case of monks belonging to the old monastic cathedrals or to those of foundations such as Gloucester and Peterborough, which were upon the dissolution created into new sees, several obtained positions in the modified establishments. The abbot or prior in several cases became the dean, and a portion of the monks continued to occupy their old stalls as secular canons. A conservative spirit which prompted them to cling to the old spot, sacred with every association of their lives, and a reluctance to turn out in old age into an unknown world is really the key to this strange want of principle which must be deplored in so many of the monks of the old foundations. An instance of this is afforded by Thomas Goldwell, cathedral prior of the great Metropolitan church of Canterbury. When first the coming changes were reported at the monastery, prior Goldwell wrote to Crumwell:—
“There is a common speaking here about us that religious men shall leave or forsake their habits and go as secular priests do. Whether they mind of some certain religious or of all I know not. As concerning this matter your lordship has been so good unto me that you have sent me word before this

* R. O. Coram Rege, 33 Hen. VIII., Trinity Rex Roll, 5.

time that I and my brethren should not be constrained so to do. And as for my part I will never desire to forsake my habit as long as I live, for divers considerations that move me to the same. One is because religious men have been and continued in this our Church these 900 years and more also. I made my profession to serve God in a religious habit as much as lay in me so to do. Also if we that be religious men do forsake our habits and go about the world, we shall have many more occasions to offend God and to commit sin than we have now. For this and other considerations which your lordship knoweth better than I, I beseech your lordship to continue good lord to us, me and my brethren, that we may keep our habits of religion still. And if any motion be made to the contrary that it may please you to be our helper and defender therein.”*

It is impossible not to admire the honourable sentiments expressed in this letter, and the love Thomas Goldwell declares both he and his brethren had for their religious habit. But when it came to the point his resolve gave way. He was, as six years before he had told Crumwell, “somewhat in age and weak and much disposed to a palsy,” and he could not contemplate the idea of having to surrender his old rooms in Christchurch monastery. He wrote an earnest letter to the all-powerful minister begging him to remain his friend, “specially now in the change of the religion of this cathedral church

* R. O. Crum. Corr., v., f. 96. Tuesday, Augt. 20th (1538).

of Canterbury from prior and convent into dean and canons. For, I am informed," he continues, "that such as be or shall be assigned and appointed by the king's majesty to be commissioners and visitors for the said change of the said church of Canterbury shall be at the same church within a little time. And of the which commission my lord of Canterbury, as I hear, shall be the chief (who is not so good lord unto me, as I would he were). Wherefore without your especial lordship I suppose my lord of Canterbury will put me to as much hindrance as he can, and also I have heard of late that my brother the warden of the manors, Dr. Thornden, is called in my lord of Canterbury's house, 'Dean of Christchurch in Canterbury.' This office of dean by the favour of your good lordship I trusted to have had and as yet trust to have. I have been prior of the said church above 22 years, wherefore it would be much displeasure to me in my age to be put from my chamber and lodging, which I have had all these 22 years.

"It hath also been shown unto me that my lord of Canterbury at his coming to the said church will take from me the keys of my chamber, and if he do, I doubt whether I shall have the same keys or chamber again or not. I have or can have none other comfort or help in this matter but only by your lordship. And where it pleased your good mind towards me to write unto me of late, by your letters, that I should have my said chamber with all com-

modities of the same as I have had in times past, the which your said writing to me was and is much to my comfort. And with the favour of your lordship I trust so to have for the term of my life, which term of my life, by course of nature cannot be long, for I am above the age of 62 years."*

Prior Goldwell, however, was doomed to disappointment. Dr. Thornden became first dean of Christchurch, and the old superior of twenty-two years' standing had to content himself with a pension of £80 a year and one of the prebendal stalls in the new foundations.

Many of the exiled monks probably found their way abroad and into Scotland, both on the suppression and after queen Mary's premature death had destroyed every hope of a monastic revival. An old monk of Westminster, named Henry Stils, who had been born blind, after wandering on the Continent, came to the abbey of Saint Ghislain,† in the Low Countries. On May 18th, 1579, he had visited the new seminary at Doway, in company with Dr. Allen, its president and founder,‡ and on October 17th, 1588, he died at Saint Ghislain, "where," as the annals relate, "he had a long time before taken refuge from the religious troubles in England and the persecutions of Catholics and above all of the religious, a great number of whom came to seek

* *Ibid.*, f. 82.

† A celebrated Benedictine abbey, in Hainaut, near Mons.

‡ Records of Eng. Caths., Douay Diaries, p. 153.

an asylum in the Low Countries." He had been brought over from London by a youth, who remained with him till his death.*

The Syon nuns are said to have always kept together. Many of them upon the suppression of their house retired to the Continent, where they continued to lead a conventual life. They were residing in a convent of their order at Dermond, in Flanders, when cardinal Pole brought them back to England in Mary's reign.† On their expulsion from England by Elizabeth these nuns did not cease to keep up regular conventual life, which has been continued until the present day. The house of Syon is now settled near Chudleigh in Devonshire, and is (perhaps with one exception) the most ancient existing of the order of St. Bridget of Sweden.

In the same way there is little doubt that some of the disbanded religious managed to reunite and for a long time live a kind of conventual existence. Thus Dame Isabel Sackville, the last prioress of Clerkenwell, is reported to have kept one or two of her nuns near her for a long time. Dame Elizabeth Shelley, last abbess of St. Mary's, Winchester, also lived for some years, with a few of the nuns, in the neighbourhood of her dismantled convent. Her last will and those of several of her nuns are yet preserved and afford some interesting particulars of the

* *Annales de l'abbaye de Saint Ghislain* in Reiffenberg's "Monuments pour servir à l'histoire des provinces de Hainaut, Namur," &c., Bruxelles, 1848, t. viii., p. 800.

† Aungier's "History of Syon," p. 97.

way in which these devout women clung to their religious profession. Thus in 1556, Agnes Badgecroft, who was subprioress of St. Mary's Abbey at the dissolution, died. She was living close to her old home and desired to be buried in the neighbouring church of St. Peter, Colebrook. "Also I bequeath," she says in her will, "my professed ring to the Blessed Sacrament to be sold and to buy therewith a canopy for the Sacrament."*

In the same way the will of Jane Wayte, "lately a religious woman within the walls of Winchester," makes bequests to four of her "sisters" in religion; it is witnessed by Richard Woodlock, formerly a monk of Hyde, and Thomas Cooke, also a Benedictine.† The abbess herself, dame Elizabeth Shelley, died in March, 1547. She left twenty shillings to each of seven nuns named, and "to every sister of the sistern house, near to St. Mary's (abbey) 12d." John White, the warden of Winchester college, was

* Mr. Baigent's MS. Collections. In the inventory of her goods taken on Oct. 5, 1556, are mentioned her monastic veils, her psalter, pair of beads and four altar cloths. "Item received for her pension 31s. 6d."

† *Ibid.* Another nun of the abbey, Edburga Stratford, whose will is dated March 18, 1552, leaves a legacy to "John Erle, rector of Empton, formerly monk of Winchester." In 1555 James Clayton, curate of the parish of St. Peter, Colebrook, leaves a legacy to one of the disbanded nuns, "Agnes Badgecroft," and to Sir Thomas Cooke, named above, "all my books to distribute as he shall think fit." The will of Morpheta Kyngsmill, last abbess of Wherwell, made 31 March, 1569, leaves bequests to seven of her old community, who were apparently living with her at her death (Mr. Baigent's MS. Collections).

her executor, and she was buried by him in the college chapel. The reverence in which this abbess was held, is evinced by a direction found in the will of Thomas Bassett, priest, and fellow of Winchester college, who died in June 1554. His last wish is, that he be buried "in the college chapel, by the side of the grave of Mrs. Shelley."*

Besides what the last abbess of Winchester bequeathed in her will, she disposed of several things by indenture. "Dame Shelley," writes bishop Milner, "continued to reside in this city (of Winchester), and it appears she had not lost all hopes of seeing her convent once more established, as she made the present of a silver chalice, which she had probably saved from the sacrilegious wreck, to the college of this city, on the express condition that it should be given to St. Mary's abbey in case it was ever restored."†

* *Ibid.*

† Milner's "Winchester," ii., 193. Some few scattered memorials of the disbanded nuns are to be found. Thus at Isleworth in Middlesex was a small brass commemorative of Margaret Dely, "a sister professed in Sion," formerly treasurer of the house, who died in 1561 (Haines' "Manual of Brasses," p. xxxix. In the second edition this brass is said to be "now on a pew door"). At Denham, Bucks, is the well-known brass of Agnes Jordan, last abbess of Sion, who died apparently in 1545 (Waller's Brasses, plate xiii.). An entry in a 17th century description of Yorkshire, speaks of a nun of Esholt. "Mr. Baildon, 1619, saith," it runs, "that Dame Margaret Martiall, sometime a nun of Esholt, lived at Fawether, adjoining (her old convent) and had a pension of £4 or £5 a year during her life, and died some 12 years since and was a good churchwoman" (B. Mus. Harl. MS., 804, f. 14).

On the other hand, some of the monks and nuns cast out into the world appear to have accommodated themselves to the circumstances of the times and fallen away from their religious obligations. Still, from such returns as exist it does not appear that this was of, at least in the case of the nuns, an ordinary matter. A certain proportion, no doubt, in the process of time would have married, but in the returns made by the commissioners sent by Edward VI. to inquire into the state of the religious pensioners, although there are a considerable number reported on, only two nuns are named as married. These two are "Elizabeth Grimston, of the age of 26," married to "one Pyckerd of Welbeck," and "Elizabeth Tyas, who lives at Tykhill and now married to one John Swyno, gentleman."* Both were young nuns of Swine Convent, in the East Riding of Yorkshire, and very possibly were never professed at all.

It is certain that out of the large number of disbanded monks many must have conformed to the religious opinions and practices of the times. One interesting anecdote of an old monk, who lived till the beginning of the seventeenth century, may be allowed to find a place here. His name was William Littleton, and on the dissolution of Evesham abbey he was "subsexton" and appears as such on the pension list.† The story of the end of his life may be told

* R. O. Chapter House Box, 154. No. 61.

† Exch. Augt. Off. Misc. Bk. 245, f. 105.

in the words of an old writer.* Speaking of father Augustine Bradshaw (the first prior of the house of St. Gregory's, Doway, now settled at Downside), it is related that "at his coming to Henlip in 1603 he was met by chance there by one Lyttleton, who had formerly been a monk of Evesham, and was now best known by the nic-name of 'parson tinker.' This man was observed to cast his eyes much upon father Augustine and being not able to hold, he asked Mr. Thomas Habington what this gentleman was, who confidently told him that it was a brother of his. 'A brother of mine!' said Mr. Lyttleton, 'I have not had any living these forty years.' 'I mean,' replied the gentleman, 'a monk of St. Benedict's Order.* At these words he seemed to alter countenance and be much moved, and at length besought Mr. Habington, for the passion of Christ, that he might speak to him. All being related to father Austin, a way was made to bring them together. As soon as Lyttleton came into the room he fell upon his knees and with floods of tears told what he was beseeching Fr. Austin to reconcile him, which he, remaining there a day or two, did. This old man being thus reclaimed went home and presently fell blind and so remained almost two years deprived of his benefice, and had he not been bed-ridden he had been imprisoned for his conscience, and so died with great repentance being near 100 years old."†

* Fr. Thomas White, *alias* Woodhope.

† Bib. Bod. Wood. MS. B. 6, f. 16. "Benedictine Obits." Fr. White mentions that he "had the story from the mouth of the worthy

When first expelled from their monasteries Wood relates that the monks flocked in great numbers to Oxford. Canterbury college, Gloucester college, Durham, St. Bernard's, St. Mary's, and other halls were full of them,* but it is curious to remark how quickly every trace of many of the monks and nuns appears to have been lost. Considerable numbers died off in the first few years after their expulsion. Many were old and sickly, and the hardships to which they were inevitably exposed, and even the change of life itself, would probably have soon carried off the aged and infirm. In the "Ministers' Accounts" are to be found numerous entries of the passing away of these religious. Thus, in the receiver's account for the counties of Norfolk and Suffolk, during the twelve months from Michaelmas, 1540, to the same feast 1541, which was practically the first year after the general dissolution, the following are recorded as having died since the last account: The prioress of Marham, the prior of Bromholme, the prior of Holy Trinity, Ipswich, the abbot of Wendling, the prior of Westacre, and his predecessor, three canons and one nun of the Gilbertine priory of Shuldhams, one canon of Walsingham, and three others who had not applied for their pensions, one canon of West-

gentleman who brought them together" (evidently Mr. Habington, of Henlip), and that "Mr. Hall of the Society assisted this old man at his death."

* "Fasti," i., p. 61.

derham, and the abbot of Bury with three of his monks.*

By 1552, or twelve years after the suppressions, very many no longer appear. The reports of the commission appointed by Edward VI. to inquire, and to which frequent reference has been made, show that a great change had taken place in the lists of pensioners. Out of twenty-two, for example, who were named on the last list as receiving annuities as monks of Durham, seven are reported as dead, two did not appear but were supposed to be living, the one at Lytham the other at Stamford, former cells of Durham. Only four, apparently, had received their payments.†

Throughout the reports great numbers are noted as "absent" or "not heard of." Thus at St. Leonard's, York, more than a third of the religious had disappeared in this way. At St. Andrew's, York, of the three names mentioned two had died recently and one had "not been heard of" by the commissioners. In the same way, to take one more example, of the fifteen canons of Welbeck who had been pensioned, only nine are named in the report of 1552. Three of these nine, including the abbot, Richard Bentley, who had been granted a pension of £50, are "unheard of," and one had sold his pension directly after it had been granted. In other places it is the same story: at Mathersey, in Nottinghamshire, out of five

* R. O. Exch. Mins. Accts., 32-33 Hen. VIII., 235.

† R. O. Chapter H. Box, 154. No. 63.

two are "unheard of;" at Wallingwells out of four nuns two are "unheard of," and the rest "unpaid."*

In the brief re-establishment of some of the monasteries during Mary's reign a few of the old monks found their way back to the cloisters. Thus the Bridgettine nuns were brought back to their old home at Syon, the Dominicans to Smithfield, the Observants to Greenwich, the Carthusians to Sheen, and the Benedictines to Westminster.† At the latter abbey Dr. Feckenham, previously a monk of Evesham, was appointed abbot, and he gathered round him a community composed of former members of the Benedictine order, comprising, amongst others, four of the old Glastonbury monks.

The restoration of that renowned sanctuary of the

* *Ibid.* No. 2.

† Mr. Baigent points out that amongst other houses which were restored in Mary's reign was that of the Franciscan Observants at Southampton. This is evident from several entries in wills at this time. Thus John Tanner, of South Stoneham, on 9 Dec., 1558, bequeaths 10s. to the friars of Hampton. So, too, in the will of Charles Harrison, physician, of the parish Holy Rood, Southampton, dated 5 Oct., 1558, are the following items:—"My body to be buried in the church of St. Francis in Southampton aforesaid;" "I give and bequeath to the brethren of St. Francis' Rule, within the town of Southampton, 40s.;" "also I give and bequeath all my books of philosophy, divinity and stories (history) to the friars observant in Southampton, to the intent that they shall be and always remain in the library of the said friars;" "I will that all my books of physic be given to a student of physic at Oxford, who hath not money to buy books, and that such a one be inquired after by such as cometh and goeth to Oxford." It may be added that Charles Harrison must have been a man of substance as he leaves his wife 256 ounces of plate and £60 in ready money.

west was also contemplated and, in fact, the work of repairing the ruined buildings was begun. So sure were these monks of the affection of the people of Somerset that they asked only for the ruins, feeling confident that their old neighbours would gladly help to build up the dismantled walls. "We ask nothing in gift to the foundation," they say, "but only the house and site, the residue for the accustomed rent, so that with our labour and husbandry we may live there a few of us in our religious habits, till the charity of good people may suffice a greater number; and the country there being so affected to our religion (*i.e.*, order), we believe we should find much help amongst them towards the reparations and furniture of the same, whereby we would haply prevent the ruin of much, and repair no little part of the whole to God's honour and for the better prosperity of the king and queen's majesties, with the whole realm."* It was intended also to restore St. Albans under the former Abbot Boreman.

Mary's death put an end to these projects of restoration and Westminster once more passed away from the keeping of the monks of St. Benedict. The closing scene may be given in the words of the historian Fuller:—"Queen Elizabeth coming to the crown, sent for abbot Feckenham to come to her, whom the messenger found setting of elms in the orchard (the college green) of Westminster abbey. But he would not follow the messenger till first he

* *Monasticon* i., 9.

had finished his plantation, which his friends impute to his being employed in mystical meditations—that as the trees he then set should spring and sprout many years after his death, so his new plantation of Benedictine monks in Westminster should take root and flourish, in defiance of all opposition.” “But how his trees thrive,” he continues, “at this day is to me unknown. Coming afterwards to the queen, what discourse passed between them they themselves know alone. Some have confidently guessed she proffered him the archbishopric of Canterbury on condition he would conform to her laws, which he utterly refused.”* “Sure I am,” adds Fuller, “that these monks long since are extirpated;” but in this assurance he was wrong; the line is continued through Feckenham to this day.

The Carthusians who were gathered together at Sheen under prior Maurice Chauncy, when Mary came to the throne, were the scattered members of the Charterhouses of England. Many died during the few years of their sojourn in England and the rest followed their superior into the Low Countries on the accession of Elizabeth. When they came to Bruges in 1568 many members of their community had received the habit in their English houses. Prior Chauncy died in Paris, July 12th, 1581, and

* Fuller, “Church Hist.,” quoted in Stanley’s “Memorials” (5th ed.), p. 405. The dean notes that “The elms, or their successors, still remain. There was, till 1779, a row of trees in the middle of the garden which was then cut down.”

the last of the old monks to pass away was father Roger Thomson, the vicar, who had been a novice at Mountgrace on the dissolution, and who died on October 20th, 1582.*

Of the house at Sheen, one anecdote is worth recording. After the monks had been exiled for some years and had settled at Bruges, amongst the English Catholic gentlemen who frequented their house was Sir Francis Englefield. On one occasion, as father Surtees who was present testifies, this Sir Francis told them a strange tale of their old house at Sheen. He said "that his tenants in England

* As so little is known about the dispersed monks the following may be of interest. The dates of the deaths are taken from a valuable MS., "History of the English Carthusians," in the library of J. Blount, Esq., of Mapledurham. The last death recorded is in 1663, and the MS. was compiled about that time. Among the old English Carthusians who were at Sheen and died in Mary's reign are: Fr. Fletcher (either of Mountgrace or Hinton), Robert Abel (Mountgrace), Robert Marshall (Mountgrace), Robert Thurlby (Sheen). Those who followed prior Chauncy abroad: Maurice Chauncy (London), *ob.* 1581, July 12. Roger Thomson (*novice* Mountgrace), *ob.* 1582, 20 Oct. Tristan Holimans or Hyckmans (Witham), *ob.* 1575, Dec. 6. Nicholas Dugmer (Beauvale) *ob.* 1575, Sept. 10. Leonard Hall or Stofs (Mountgrace), *ob.* 1575, Oct. 10. Nicholas Bolsand (Hinton), *ob.* Dec. 5, 1578. William Holmes (Hinton).

Besides these there were one or two others, probably belonging to ancient houses, but whom it is difficult to identify on the pension lists. To the above must be added Br. Hugh Taylor, a lay-brother. Additional MSS. 17085 (f. 106), and 17092 (ff. 78, 114, 152, 196), contain obits (*year* only) of this community from 1662 to 1757. The lists include the good old Catholic names of Gerard, Constable, Dolman, Brigham, Towneley, Yates. Earlier obits are scattered in various places through the latter volume.

had written unto him that they dwelling near unto Sheen heard for nine nights together, the monks that father Maurice (Chauncy) had buried in Sheen, singing service with lights in the church. And, when they did, of purpose, set ladders to the church walls to see them in the church, suddenly they ceased: and they heard father Fletcher's voice, which everyone knew above all."* This community of English Carthusians at length settled at Nieuport, and there continued until their monastery was suppressed by Joseph II. The last monk of Sheen, prior Williams, died at Little Malvern Court, in Worcestershire, where the limits the old man had set himself for his "enclosure" are still remembered.

From Mary's death little is known of the fate of the surviving monks. Only very trifling items of information have been preserved to posterity. Thus, in 1576, it appears that amongst those indicted for being at mass in "the house of John Pinchin," of Westminster, "sometime of the Middle Temple, and an attorney at the common law," was "Hugh Phillips, late monk of Westminster, the priest who said mass,"† and who had before the suppression been a member of the Ramsey community.‡

Three years later there were two septuagenarian monks in the Marshalsea prison—Thomas Cook

* *Ibid.*, p. 128. There were two Carthusians of the name of Fletcher: father Robert at Mountgrace, and father Thomas at Hinton, in Somerset.

† B. Mus. Lans. MS., 19, f. 59.

‡ R. O. Exch. Augt. Off. Misc. Bk., 245, f. 64.

and Thomas Rede,* the latter, probably, a monk of Hayles, in Gloucestershire, the former a canon of Christchurch, Twyneham. In 1585 John Almond, a Cistercian of about 76 years of age, died in the castle of Hull, having been a prisoner there in 1579.† Two years previously, Thomas Madde, a monk of Jervaulx, died in the prison of York. Of him it is said that in the reign of Henry VIII. he "did take away and hide the head of one of his brethren of the same house, who had suffered death, for that he would not yield and consent 'to the royal supremacy.' Afterwards he fled, lest he should offend God and trouble his conscience by the doing of any unlawful acts, unto St. Andrew's in Scotland, where he did remain unto the end of king Edward's reign. He, returning in queen Mary's reign, did spend his time about Knaresbro' in serving God according to his vocation, and teaching of gentlemen's children and others."‡

One other instance of a like nature and recording the end of a nun may be added here. Dame Isabel Whitehead was professed at the convent of Arthington, in Yorkshire, "until it was suppressed. Yet," says the account of her, "she continued her state as she could, so far as I know." She lived with "lady Midelton, at Stuborn, or Stokell (Stockeld), until she died and then wandering up and down, doing

* B. Mus. Lansd. MS., 28, f. 96.

† *Ibid.*

‡ Records of Eng. Prov. S.J., Vol. iii., p. 239.

The Ejected Monks and their Pensions. 489

charitable works . . . till she stayed" with a Mrs. Ardington. There she became ill, and whilst in that state the house was searched at Michaelmas, 1587, for Catholics. The officers took Mrs. Ardington and her daughter, and "also entered the place wherein dame Isabel Whitehead, a nun, lay sick in her bed. They stood over her with their naked swords and rapiers, and did threaten to kill her unless she would tell where David Ingleby and Mr. Winsour were." She was carried away to York castle, where she died in the following March, "and was buried under the castle wall."*

* *Ibid.*, p. 731

CHAPTER XII.

SOME RESULTS OF THE SUPPRESSION.

IN entire consistency with the infamy heaped upon the monasteries has been the current estimate of the social consequences of their suppression. Grave writers no less than partisans have treated the matter as though their spoliation had resulted in great advantage to society at large, inasmuch as by it the honey was taken from the drones of the hive and handed over to the working bees. It is difficult to say which branch of this comparison is the more absolutely false to fact. Even supposing that the thousands then living under vows had led the aimless and dissipated existences attributed to them by their despoilers, it might be asked, not without reason, whether any signal amount of private or public virtue was displayed by the courtiers and creatures of Henry VIII. If the buildings wherein the monks were housed and the churches they had raised to the glory of God were vast in extent and magnificent in design, so that, to use the words of a contemporary witness, they constituted "one of the beauties of this realm to all men and strangers passing through the same,"*

* R. O. Chapter House Bk. A. 29, p. 210. Aske's Examination.

what particular advantage accrued to the state from their desecration and wholesale destruction? If the hospitality dispensed to all comers by the monastic owners was generous and profuse, was the public interest greatly advanced by the private consumption of the very sources of that charity amongst a few royal or noble appropriators?

Such a line of argument, however, though serving fairly enough to expose the facility with which some writers, of cool judgment in other matters, accept transparent fallacies when dealing with monasticism, so far from covering the whole case, leaves room for the retort always tacitly implied, if not openly expressed, that no matter what evils may come from the suppression of the religious houses, they could not equal those which would have resulted from their continuance. Certainly had those institutions been the abodes of wickedness and strongholds of oppression depicted by the false witnesses whom our English Ahab commissioned to slander the Naboth whose fair vineyard he coveted; had the sole business of the monks consisted in extorting by spiritual intimidation, and by chicanery and fraudulent deceits, the means for living in feasting and drunkenness; had their occupation been that of wallowing in unmentionable vice; for that in plain English is the picture drawn by their spoliators—then unquestionably, whatever scars may have been inflicted by the cautery, they would have been incomparably more tolerable than the canker.

Nor, it may be here observed, is excuse altogether wanting for those who at a later day gave credence to the statements of Henry's commission without examining into the credibility of the wretched men whom modern research is denouncing to the world as perjured robbers.* If such a denunciation may

* There is no intention to excuse Burnet; he had the means of knowing the truth and telling it if he would.

It is remarkable that the evil repute of monks and friars dates from his period. Macaulay has pointed out (Essay on "Burleigh and his Times") that "the greatest and most popular dramatists of the Elizabethan age . . . treat the vow of celibacy, so tempting, and, in later times, so common a subject of ribaldry, with mysterious reverence. Almost every member of a religious order whom they introduce is a holy and venerable man. We remember," he says, "in their plays nothing resembling the coarse ridicule with which the Catholic religion and its ministers were assailed, two generations later, by dramatists who wished to please the multitude."

That the people were not readily weaned from their affection for the religious may be understood from the popular demands of the Devonshire insurgents in 1549. The two reasons which actuated them were—"the one, the oppression of the gentry in enclosing of their commons from them; the other, the laying aside the old religion, which because it was old and the way their forefathers worshipped God, they were very fond of." Their demands were drawn up in a bill of fifteen articles, and answered by Cranmer. Amongst their stated grievances were that the Latin mass, images, worshipping the blessed Sacrament, purgatory, private masses, the "hanging of the host over the altar," holy bread and holy water, ashes, palms and the pope's authority had been done away with. These they demanded to be restored (Strype's "Cranmer," ed. 1812, pp. 264-6), adding "we will not receive the new service, because it is but like a Christmas game; but we will have our old service of matins, mass, even-song, and procession in Latin as it was before" (*Ibid.*, Appendix, p. 826). With regard to the

appear at first sight strong, even to violence, it will upon reflection be seen rather to fall short of the truth. For, although in describing the actual events the pen may, not without difficulty, be confined to a simple narration, yet when the mind contemplates the innumerable miseries entailed upon successive generations by that wholesale appropriation of the

monasteries, the fourteenth article said:—"We will that the half part of the abbey lands and chantry, in every man's possession, howsoever he came by them, be given again to places where two of the chief abbeys were within every county. Where such half-part shall be taken out and there to be established a place for devout persons, who shall pray for the king and the commonwealth, and to the same we will have all the alms of the church-box given for these seven years" (*Ibid.*, p. 837). From this it may be concluded (1) the petitioners did not contemplate the restoration of abbeys solely at other people's expense; (2) The country people were not merely willing to bear, as the petition of the Glastonbury monks to Queen Mary also assumes, a portion of that expense themselves, but they expected, *i.e.*, knew, the movement for restoration of abbeys would be a thoroughly popular one. (3) It may be observed as yet a further proof of the quality of the accusations against the monasteries made by Crumwell's minions that Cranmer's answer to this article of the Commons of Devon expresses horror at the idea of taking away monastic property from the new ten year owners, and on that theme he scolds like a fishwife. But he nowhere gives even so much as a hint of the obvious reply, if the monasteries had really been as Henry made out to the Parliament of 1536, and as late generations have imagined. The answer of Nicholas Udall (in Pocock's "Troubles connected with the Prayer Book of 1549," Camden Soc., pp. 183-4) is more like that of a statesman; but he makes no such reference either; his answer to this fourteenth article may be summed up: "Wait till the next parliament; ask of *it*, and I dare say you will get this petition granted." What may have been Udall's real opinion on that point does not affect the present argument.

property of the Church and the poor, it is almost incompatible with any instinct of justice to refrain from characterizing in language only too abundantly justified those infamous instruments of a ruler who alone was their rival in infamy. For when we look into the case in detail and reflect, it is impossible not to see in the spoliation and destruction of the monasteries the fount and origin of many of those appalling sores in the body of the nation from which at times the veil is torn away. Not in figure merely, but in grim, literal, earnest truth, the sacred heritage of the English poor was eaten up by the house of Tudor; and to such an extent did extravagance of food, of dress and of every kind of living ensue, that not a few of the spoilers paid in their own ruin the penalty of their transgression.

To trace in detail the consequences which this act of wholesale waste entailed upon society at large would be a task beyond the present scope; partly because such a discussion would evidently be of a magnitude exceeding the original subject, and partly because the design of the present work is to deal with direct testimony, whereas any deductions as to the effects of this lawless act, however clearly they may be supported by evidence, must of necessity be in a measure inferential. Still, any description of the events which led up to and accompanied the suppression of these institutions, which should take no account of the important social effects which followed from it, would be imperfect.

Two great and fruitful ideas were kept constantly before the mind of the nation by the existence of these monastic houses—the life of perpetual praise, and the life of associated labour. *Laborare est orare* was the familiar principle which animated the course of every well-directed monastic house, and which was, so to speak, the conservation of the spiritual forces, whereby the energy of faithful work became interchangeable with the energy of unremitting prayer. With regard to the latter, it is here only needful to remark that every minister of religion finds it necessary at times to urge upon his hearers a more constant and continuous worship, rightly alleging that what is here confined to a few hours will form the whole occupation of the saints in the life to come. To carry out this principle of perpetual praise with the utmost solemnity attainable was the first end of the monastic life.

But though the service of God was beyond all question the prime object of monastic life, yet the more closely that life is examined the more clearly does it exhibit the element of associated labour. In the popular estimate current at the present day, and derived in great measure from those kindly mis-describers, Sir Walter Scott and the author of the “*Ingoldsby Legends*,” it is not unusual to imagine that a monk, although possibly a pious, was at all events a very indolent personage, and that the utmost he accomplished was to mumble—he was always supposed to mumble—a good many more

prayers than other people, and to live on the fat of the land in return.

As this conception of the monastic daily life is without doubt very deeply and widely accepted, it may not be without use to inquire whether the prolonged existence of a perfectly idle and undisciplined body would even be possible. To take a case which illustrates precisely the situation popularly ascribed to the monks, imagine a college at Oxford, the fellows enjoying the revenues bequeathed for pious purposes without performing service of any sort or description in return, and living as they please, without the slightest regard to any duty imposed upon them by the founder or their statutes. Conceive that in one of these institutions the whole body of fellows, say thirty or forty in number, instead of having the liberty to go about the world as they choose and living wherever it may best suit them, should be compelled to enclosure from year's end to year's end, with nothing to do but to say their prayers within the four walls of the college! Such a condition of affairs would exactly correspond with the normal state of a monastery where vocation was overlooked, discipline not enforced, and work not exacted from the inmates. Those who know Oxford best can best conceive how long such a state of affairs would be likely to last.

In strong contrast with the caricature drawn from the imagination of novelists, who at best clothe the cloistered life with a poetic unreality, the descrip-

tion given of it by a deeply-read writer of modern times may be here quoted. "The monks," says Mr. Thorold Rogers, "were the men of letters in the middle ages, the historians, the jurists, the philosophers, the physicians, the students of nature, the founders of schools, authors of chronicles, teachers of agriculture, fairly indulgent landlords and advocates of genuine dealing towards the peasantry."

It will be well in the first place to clear up a confusion of ideas which arises in the minds of many who have not paid particular attention to the subject, by the indiscriminate use of the word "monk" to cover all the various kinds of regulars in England during the middle ages. These may be first divided roughly into two classes: the more ancient orders and those which sprang up in the thirteenth century. The latter, the friars, were essentially townspeople. Their life and work consisted in preaching, teaching, hearing confessions and other such like directly spiritual ministrations, and it was from their qualifications in these matters that came their influence whether with people or king.

The canons regular, Austin and others, occupied as position somewhat midway between the monk and the secular clergy. Many, whilst remaining attached to their monasteries, were engaged in parochial duties, but the bulk of them still maintained a community life much like the monks themselves. The term "monks," strictly speaking,

applied only to the Benedictine order in all its branches, and to the Carthusians. Even among those professing the rule of St. Benedict there is a broad line of distinction. The English black-monks (Benedictines) and the white Cistercians differed in their character, work and ways. Both were great landowners, and it is true that at the time of the dissolution most if not all of the Cistercian houses seem to have approximated to the character of the Benedictine abbey. But, speaking generally, and taking in view also the preceding centuries, it may be said that the Cistercians were essentially farmers and farming their own lands themselves. This they were able to do the better through the institute of *fratres conversi*, or lay brethren, which flourished among them. In course of time this system was abandoned in England; for instance, at Meaux abbey the *conversi* died out towards the end of the fourteenth century.* But in all probability the specially industrial and agricultural character—the traditional features—of the Cistercian house remained much the same. In proportion to their income the Cistercian communities were, at least until the later years of their existence, larger than the Benedictine. In fact, complaints are not infrequent that the Cistercians admitted more members into their houses than their revenues sufficed to support. Among the English black monks the system of lay brethren, which had been successful

* "Chron. de Melsa.," ed. Bond. iii., 229.

in other countries, never took root. With them, as with the canons Regular, the place of lay brethren was supplied by numerous paid lay servants and officers. This, if it may appear to some to have had certain disadvantages, linked them the more closely with the world about them just as the great position of the heads of the Benedictine house brought them into touch with public life. Their monasteries, apart from dependent cells, were hardly more numerous than those of the Cistercians, and even with the cells they were considerably less in number than those of the Canons Regular. But the size, importance and wealth of the Benedictine houses gave the black monks a singular pre-eminence in England. It will be seen, therefore, how different was the hereditary character of a Benedictine and Cistercian community, though both belonged, strictly speaking, to the same order, and came under the same profession. Even the atmosphere which pervaded each was different. All this is patent to anyone who compares, for example, the domestic chronicles of the Cistercian house of Meaux with those of the abbey of St. Albans.

In speaking, therefore, of the social changes effected by the dissolution of monasteries, it is these last classes, the monks and regular canons, and, of course, the nunneries, that are chiefly brought into consideration. For if their work in the Church was less exclusively one of spiritual administration than that of the friars, it was marked

by a character of general helpfulness and public spirit.

It was the possessions of the monastic houses in particular that, to use the words of an old writer, were popularly regarded as "oblations to the Lord" and "the patrimony of the poor 'to be bestowed accordingly.'"^{*} The monks whereof "taught and preached the faith and good works and practised the same both in word and deed; not only within the monasteries but also all abroad without." . . . "They made such provision daily for the people that stood in need thereof, as sick, sore, lame or otherwise impotent that none or very few lacked relief in one place or another. Yea, many of them, whose revenues were sufficient thereto made hospitals and lodgings within their own houses, wherein they kept a number of impotent persons with all necessaries for them, with persons to attend upon them: besides the great alms they gave daily at their gates to everyone that came for it. Yea, no wayfaring person could depart without a night's lodging, meat, drink and money; (it not) being demanded, from whence he or she came and whither he would go.[†]

"They taught the unlearned that was put to them to be taught: yea the poor as well as the rich, without demanding anything for their labour, other

^{*} B. Mus. Cole MS., xii. Written about the year 1591. A portion of this document has already been quoted, giving a description of the dissolution of Roche abbey.

[†] p. 5.

than what the rich parents were willing to give to them of mere devotion.*

“ There was no person that came to them heavy or sad for any cause that went away comfortless. They never revenged them of any injury, but were contented to forgive it freely upon submission. And if the price of corn had begun to start up in the markets they made thereunto with wainloads of corn and sold it under the market price to poor people to the end to bring down the price thereof. If the highways, bridges or causeways were tedious to the passengers that sought their living by their travel, their great help lacked not towards the repair and amending thereof : yea, oftentimes they amended them on their own proper charges.

“ If any poor householder had lacked seed to sow his land or bread or corn or malt, before the harvest and come to the monastery, either of men or women, he should have had it until harvest, that he might easily have paid it again. Yea, if he had made his moan for an ox, horse or cow he might have had it upon his credit. And, such was the good conscience of the borrowers in those days, that the thing borrowed needed not to have been asked at the day of payment.

“ They never raised any rent, or took any incomes or garsomes of their tenants ; nor ever took in or improved any commons : although the most part and the greatest was ground belonging to their profes-

* p. 6.

sions." . . . "All sorts of people were helped and succoured by abbeys. Yea, happy was that person that was tenant to an abbey, for it was a rare thing to hear that any tenant was removed by taking his farm over his head. He was not afraid of any re-entry for non-payment of his rent, if necessity drove him thereunto. And thus they fulfilled all the works of charity in all the country round about them to the good example of all lay persons that now have taken forth other lessons, that is *nunc tempus alios postulat mores.*"

It might be objected that this is a fancy picture drawn after date; but not merely is it the work of one who well remembered the ancient days, but it agrees entirely with the declaration of Robert Aske, written half-a-century before, to say nothing of so many other contemporary testimonies and well ascertained facts. Even if it were granted that in this or that detail the picture be heightened by an old man's fancy playing upon early memories, as a whole and in substance it is unquestionably true, and it shows the "common fame" which the monasteries left after them, a fame wholly incompatible with the infamies of later repute; for the works of Christian charity can flow from but a single source, the love of God, and love of man in Him.

The same writer points out how by the property obtained from the dissolutions the rich mounted up to place and power, whilst the poor, deprived of their protectors and inheritance, sank deeper into the

slough of poverty. For the suppressions "made of yeomen and artificers, gentlemen, and of gentlemen, knights, and so forth upward, and of the poorest sort, stark beggars."*

And the commons, he says, were robbed not only in the actual taking away, but in the consequences. For the owners, who succeeded the monks, always try "to make the most of everything," which "abbots, abbesses and such like never did." . . . "Inferior persons made gentlemen," always desiring to make a show are not "content, as other ancient gentlemen in times past did," and hence are constantly compelled to raise their rents.

Moreover, the new owners of the soil everywhere took hold of waste ground and common land. By this practice, he continues, "the poor cottagers that always before might have kept a cow for sustaining himself, his wife and children and twenty sheep towards their clothing, now is not able to keep so much as a goose or a hen. Yea, the common arable fields that were common to all persons dwelling within the townships (as well the poor as the rich) are taken in and enclosed. By reason thereof the ground is worth so much that the poor cottagers, now innumerable (for in most *towns* for every cottage [at the time of the suppression] there are

* p. 18. It is worth while to note how singularly the description of this anonymous writer, speaking with the facts before his eyes, agrees in regard to the degradation of the English labourer, with the results obtained from purely documentary evidence by professor Thorold Rogers.

five now, and far more poor persons in them)* and other poor husbandmen can neither have their common therein as they had before the inclosure nor are able to pay for as much as a 'beastgate' within it, the rent is so great. Hence only wealthy farmers with money to buy cattle" can use the land; the poorer class "are brought to such poverty" that they cannot maintain their families "and pay their landlords their rents."†

By the enclosure of the commons the artificer in the town was no longer able to keep a cow for his household or a horse to carry his wares to market since the people's pasturage was gone. Since the fall of the abbeys "great woods" had been cut down and sold, everyone thinking of himself and "the present gain," so that the poor had great difficulty in getting wood for firing and for their various industries. By the dearth of cattle both leather and wool had become dearer. The poor, moreover, had less acknowledged right to a share of Church revenues. For, on the one hand, the married clergy supported their families out of their dues, and little could be left for those in want. And, on the other hand, the tithes "which belonged

* In this he is calling attention to the migration of the country population to the towns, forced on by the increasing difficulty of remaining on the soil. As there was no corresponding increase in manufacturing industry it is patent what an aggravation of poverty must have resulted.

† p. 35.

to vicarages now in temporal men's hands" were very considerable, but the owners "did not think they were more bound to contribute on this account to the poor than others."*

It is impossible to read any account of the work done by the monastic institutions for the poor without perceiving in how many directions this present generation has been compelled by very necessity to devise some substitute for the consideration thus exercised. Our modern workhouses, our burial clubs, our hospitals and charities ever crying out for funds, much of which is swallowed up by paid organization and management, what are they but awkward and imperfect agencies for executing a portion of those duties to society which flowed naturally and unobtrusively from the religious communities in their ordinary practice of Christian charity?

That the wholesale uprooting of institutions so organic and so beneficent must have occasioned incalculable misery is rarely denied, though its extent is little understood. Amongst the writers who have treated this subject from the economic point of view a tolerably general consensus prevails that the condition of pauperism, as distinguished from that of poverty, may be traced distinctly to this event. Many, however, seem to consider such a condition as a kind of self-curable, if not self-engendered, disease. Even so just and usually well-

* pp. 36-38.

informed a writer as professor Thorold Rogers expresses a doubt whether the monks did not create much of the poverty which they alleviated. Of course, to those who consider almsgiving universally and essentially objectionable, no general answer can here be given beyond observing that they who would maintain this must at least be prepared to throw over the commands of the gospel, the example of the apostles, the teaching of the Christian Church, the instincts of humanity, and the universal practice of every civilized state. And, as a matter of fact, pauperism, which immediately after became a rampant evil, was kept within bounds so long as the monasteries remained untouched.

But many causes were even then at work, which in all probability would have rendered, in process of time, the old monastic methods of dealing with the evil inadequate. Still, the overthrow of the existing sources of charity, and their appropriation to quite other uses, was a fertile source of misery at the time, and up to the present. Nor is it easy to see how it could be good policy to disband corporations to whom the disposal of alms, in the spirit of Christian charity, was not merely a duty, but had become a familiar habit, and who, open as they were to the great waves of public feeling, and by tradition not unmindful of the public welfare, would not in the future have been less thrifty stewards had the need of strenuous effort and modified methods to meet a growing public evil been brought before

them.* This would have been easy in view of the influence which the so-called "founder" could bring to bear in every case. Not only were the channels through which all relief flowed to the people destroyed, but the very fountain head of the accumulated charity of previous generations was dried up at its source when the property of the religious houses was, without inquiry or discrimination, swept into the capacious purse of Henry. Even had the wealth acquired by the spoils of monasteries, churches, schools and hospitals been entirely applied to useful and national purposes, it would still be true that these objects were achieved in great measure at the expense of the poorer members of the nation. As it was, a considerable part went to minister to the private wants of the king, and to enrich his noble and ignoble courtiers. They grew great, whilst the poor became "stark beggars."

Nor must it be forgotten that the process, which consumed the very sources of charity, cast many thousands upon the world without sufficient means

* It has been pointed out that the incomes of a few modern millionaires would cover the revenues of all the religious houses. To make the monastic revenues suffice for all calls on them it is clear that whatever may have been the case at this or that date, with this or that particular monastery, their administration as a whole must have been marked by thrift. Take as an example the first that comes to hand: nearly a century ago, John Nichols printed the accounts of the priory of Huntingdon for the nine months, from Michaelmas, 1517. The following is a summary statement. To bring the facts more closely home the figures have been multiplied by ten, which will give some sort of approximation

of livelihood. Not only the numbers of monks and nuns, for whom clearly no provision was made in the way of pension, were turned adrift to swell the ranks of the poor, but the far greater number of those dependent on the monastic houses were dis-
to modern values. The house at that time consisted of a prior, 11 canons and 34 servants. (Pence have been omitted below.)

Income for the nine months	£2202 10 0
Dues to the king, vicars, etc. (of which about £130 to the king)	£318 8 0
Fees, synodals, tithes, etc.	122 14 0
Chapel keeper and candles (guests' chapel)... ..	4 11 0
Clothing (including £26 13s. for outfit of a scholar)	136 13 0
Expenses on obits	20 7 0
Fees to steward, etc.	27 10 0
Fees to bailiffs	24 3 0
Wages to prior's servants	35 16 0
Wages to farm servants	134 4 0
Repairs of churches, etc.	12 18 0
Repairs of buildings of monastery	17 10 0
Repairs of house property	49 14 0
Miscellaneous household expenses (linen, pewters, tubs, and buckets, etc., etc.)	24 0 0
Cost of journeys	12 8 0
Gifts in money	42 8 0
Farm repairs and miscellaneous farm expenses (of which threshing £20)	67 15 0
Bread bought for guests (bishop's visitation, etc.) £6 2s. }	17 12 0
Wine do. (do.) 2 10s. }	
Good ale do. (do.) 9 }	
Fuel	33 5 0
Lights... ..	9 0 0
Wheat, malt, barley bought... ..	141 19 0
Stock bought	111 8 0
Legal expenses	6 19 0
"Expenses of howshold, as appereth by ye kechyn boke"	417 3 0
Debts paid	422 10 0
	£2210 15 0

On the foregoing it may be well to make the following remarks :—
(1) The expenses of keeping up the priory church evidently formed

missed to find occupation or living as best they could. At the same time, the new proprietors of the abbey-lands treated the old tenants, with whom they had no sympathy, most harshly, and reduced many to a state of destitution. The monks had the character of being easy landlords, and one of the first objects of the royal agents was to rackrent the holders of the monastic farms. Thus, in his first account, John Freeman boasts that of the houses he has received in Lincolnshire, and the rental of which had been returned as £8,100 a year, "there hath been more increased by my survey, than was pre-

a separate account on separate funds, kept by the sacrist; (2) the smallness of the wages to the numerous servants is noticeable; this confirms the statements as to the free grant of land and cottage as part of wages; (3) the kitchen book, wheat, stock, etc., would cover most of the expenses for food not only of the community and doubtless some of the servants, but also guests and poor. The purchase of wine and a special good ale for my lord bishop and his officials shows the frugality of the ordinary convent fare; it is noticeable in this regard that whilst the wine at the visits of my lord and of master chancellor cost a little over £1 each, the "Malvesey and sugre" purchased for the "visitors of our religion" cost just 4 shillings and 2 pence; Mr. archdeacon has to himself the remaining three and fourpence worth.

For example of a town house compare the abstract of the kitchen accounts of Holy Trinity, Aldgate, also Augustinian, for 1515-1516 in Calendar, Vol. ii., pt. 1, p. 40. Mr. Brewer notes:—"The provision for the convent is less plentiful and varied than that for the steward" (*i.e.*, for guests, etc.). This is borne out by the specimen accounts for the weeks beginning Saturday, 7 October, 1514, and 2 June, 1515. The difference is perceptible even in the menu for the dinner for guests and convent on Trinity Sunday, the great feast day of the house. It will be noticed (p. 38) that the purchases of wine are "chiefly for the entertainment of strangers."

sented . . . yearly by £800."* To give another illustration. On the granges belonging to Fountains abbey, rented at £156 13s. 4d. by the monks, the king's valuers, in 1540, put a price of £30 a year more; and thirty-five years afterwards, in 1575, Gresham's rental, without including five of the granges, was £45 7s. more than the whole were rented at in the royal valuation of 1540.†

But beyond this consumption by the "classes" of the heritage of their poorer brethren at the time of the suppression, an additional and heavy wrong was done them by branding poverty with the mark of crime. To be poor was not before regarded as a reproach in itself, but rather upon every Christian principle poverty was held in honour. To Henry belongs the singular distinction, which few will be inclined to dispute with him, of having invented literally no less than figuratively "the Badge of Poverty," and of being the first to dress a "pauper" in a "pauper dress." It may fairly be doubted whether any single act of monarch or statesman ever did so much to vulgarize the character of an entire nation as Henry's when he bestowed nine-

* R. O. Chapter House Bk., A. $\frac{4}{30}$, f. 155.

† "Memorials of Fountains," J. R. Walbran, Surtees Soc. The editor in a note, p. 254, noticing the above facts, states that it "will show that the monks were just and merciful landlords: and that the lament on the fall of the abbeys in these parts, which old Henry Jenkins lived to report to the cavaliers and roundheads, might have partially arisen from more material reasons than a change of religion."

pence a week on each of the thirteen poor men, hitherto supported by the monks of Gloucester, on condition that their caps and cloaks should bear a badge emblazoned with a token of the royal munificence.*

How soon the effect of the transfer of land from the old to the new owners and the desolation it brought in its train was visible in the country may be learnt from a description of the state of the land addressed to Henry VIII. himself by a travelling artisan.† Speaking of the great increase in the number of poor people, the writer proceeds to explain what he takes to be the causes. "For where," he says, "that your grace and your grace's predecessors have given and put in fee farm lordships to your rulers and gentlemen of your realm, whom your grace puts in trust to the intent that they should aid and defend your poor subjects and commons in all right and justice. But alas I think your poor sub-

* R. O. Exch. Mins. Accts. 31-32 Hen. VIII., 263 m. 9d. A curious instance may be cited of the way the poor and sick simply disappeared when deprived of the care of the religious who attended them, and left to the mercy of the royal officials. The hospital for poor and sick at Bishopsgate, in London, was taken by the king on December 1st, 1539. There were at the time 34 poor in the establishment attended by six canons and two sisters. The first week each of these poor people received eightpence. For the next four weeks there were only 32 paid, then 30, and by March 19th there were only 20. At the end of the month they had been reduced to 16, and by September to only 8 (R. O. Exch. Mins. Accts., 31-32 Hen. VIII., 253, m. 12).

† A native of Wiltshire, John Bayker. R. O. State Papers, Dom., 411 I,

jects had never more need to complain unto your grace in any matter than they have in this, which if it please your grace to pardon me your subject I shall shortly show. . .

“Your grace shall understand that I am a poor artificer or craftsman who has travelled and gone through the most part of your realm to get and earn my living. I have been in the most part of the cities and great towns of England. I have also gone through many little towns and villages, but, alas! it did pity my heart to see in every place so many monuments where houses and habitations had been, and now nothing but bare walls standing. (This), methinks, is very dishonourable unto your highness. And, not that only, but by the occasion thereof much inconvenience doth encrease among your people. It causeth men to lie by the highway side and there one to rob and undo another. . . . For, if so (it) were, that every man might have in towns and villages but one little house or cottage to inhabit, and but a little garden ground withal, they would so order it with their labour that they would earn a living, so that there should be no place untilled nor without inhabitants. . .

“Now if it please your grace to hear what is the cause of such decay and ruin within your realm, your grace shall understand that in every place where your grace’s majesty hath given in fee farm any lordship to any gentleman, or such as be your grace’s fee farmers, (they) should let them again unto your poor

subjects to inhabit and till, that they paying their rent truly to their lords might have a sufficient and complete living by their labour.

“ But alas ! how far are these fee farmers or rulers wide in either point. For if so be that any of these fee farmers have any tenement or farm in their hands, if a poor man come unto any of them desiring him to be good unto him in this tenement or farm that he might have it to inhabit, paying the rent for it as it hath been before time : He answers and saith, ‘ If thou wilt have this tenement of me thou must pay me so much money at your coming in for a fine : ’ so that he raiseth what never was at any fine before, to a great sum of money, and the rent to be paid yearly besides. The poor (man) then seeing there is no remedy but either to have it or be destitute of an habitation sells all he hath from wife and children to pay the fine. Then the landlord perceiving the house in decay will not repair it, although the tenant paid ever so much for his fine, and the tenant comes to a decayed thing. Then the landlord perceiving that the house is ready to fall down calls the tenant into court and there commands him to build up his house before a certain day under pain of forfeiting a certain sum of money. Then the poor man, because he paid so great a sum of money for the fine is not able to build up his house so quickly. Then a second time is he called up again to the court and there commanded under pain of forfeiting his tenement to build it so that the poor man

being not able to repair it forfeits it again unto the lord.

“And now because it is so far in decay and the fine so great withal, no one is desirous to take it so that the house cometh down shortly after. ‘Yet,’ saith the landlord, ‘the lands shall raise me as much rent as they did before when the house was standing.’ Oh, good lord! how much more do these men regard their own peculiar and proper advantage than your grace’s honour or (care) where your people should inhabit. . . .

“Your grace may see how hard hearted they are unto their tenants that they rather let (houses) fall than build. Is it not a pitiful thing to come into a little village town where there have been twenty or thirty houses and now one-half of them nothing but bare walls standing? Is it not a pitiful thing to see one man have in his hand what sufficed (for) two or three men when the habitations were standing? No doubt this thing is the cause of much inconvenience within your realm.”

In later times still the evils here recorded were intensified, and the poverty of the nation at large could not be disguised. Everywhere we read of a host of mendicants, of thieves, of vagabonds, so that for one beggar in the reign of Henry there were a hundred in the days of Elizabeth.* Then those who

* B. Mus. Cole MS., xii., p. 41. This author, before quoted at length, gives the following example of the immense numbers of beggars then (1591) in the country:—“At the funeral of George, late earl of Shrewsbury, celebrated at Sheffield in Yorkshire, the

had seized the inheritance proclaimed the poverty of those they had robbed a crime. Merciless and monstrous statutes enacted by the spoliators was the remedy by which it was sought to reduce the disease, and the rulers of the state did not shrink from introducing slavery, and inflicting even death for the crime of poverty, of which they had been the patent origin.

Hundreds of men and women, whose birthright had been divided amongst the rich and powerful, were cast into prison, scourged, and reduced to the condition of slaves, or hanged for the crime of going about the country to seek a livelihood or for asking an alms when failing to find employment in the midst of the general distress and the disorders of national bankruptcy.*

13th day of January in the 33rd year (1591), there were by the report of such as served the dole unto them, the number of 8,000. And they thought that there were almost as many more that could not be served, through their unruliness. Yea, the press was so great that divers were slain and many hurt. And further it is reported of credible persons, that well estimated the number of all the said beggars, that they thought there were about 20,000." From this, says our author, some idea may be formed of the great poverty, "for it is thought by great conjecture, that all the said poor people were abiding and dwelling within 30 miles' compass of Sheffield," and that there were many more who could not go to receive the dole.

* It is right to state that as early as 22 and 27 Hen. VIII. two statutes assigned punishments to promiscuous begging, and to "men and women, being whole and mighty in body," who were found vagrant. These latter were "to be had to the next market-town, and there to be tied to the end of a cart, naked, and to be beaten with whips throughout the same town till his body be bloody

The effect of Henry's policy in dividing the monastic estates among his courtiers was in reality to create a monopoly in land. So long as they remained in the hands of their rightful owners, those corporations, not being subject to demise, dealt with the tenants according to immemorial custom, and never aimed at extorting the last penny of profit from the cultivator. But the new grantees were not actuated by a like consideration and rents were everywhere increased.

This was tantamount to nothing less than a revolution effected by the powerful against the weak. "The further we look back into history," says Mr.

by reason of such whipping." These and other severe measures were found necessary, even before the dissolution of the monasteries. After that event the evil was augmented. By a statute (1 Edw. VI., c. 3) the vagrant is styled a "slave." If he was 18 years old it was ordained that on a second conviction he should suffer death unless some one would take him into service for two years. On the third conviction the *sturdy* rogue had no escape from the gallows.

The 14 Elizabeth, c. 5, made it criminal to be a vagrant. Every such one over 14, male or female, should, on the conviction of so odious an offence, be grievously whipped and burned through the gristle of the right ear with a hot iron of the compass of an inch, unless some one would take him into service. The branding was sent clean through the gristle of the ear. The condition of the convicted in service was that of a slave.

In a year (14-15 Elizabeth) 20 vagrants were so convicted at the Middlesex Sessions. On one occasion, in 1591 (the year referred to in the last note), 71 persons, male and female, aged 14 and upwards, were sentenced to be whipped and branded, an average of seven a week during that period.—*Vide* "Middlesex County Records," i., Introd. i.

J. S. Mill, speaking especially in regard to rent, "the more we see all transactions and engagements under the influence of fixed customs. The reason is evident. Custom is the most powerful protector of the weak against the strong; their sole protector where there are no laws or government adequate to the purpose. Custom is a barrier which even in the most oppressed condition of mankind tyranny is forced in some degree to respect." But in the revolutionary proceedings of Henry's reign no degree of respect was paid to custom, and, that protecting barrier thrown down, the weak were left to the mercy of the powerful.*

The results of the dissolution were not merely felt in the country parts. They affected the fishing population of the coasts. Many monasteries had their own fish-ponds, but others purchased fish in large quantities, for transit was not in those days so difficult as might be imagined. In the old days when the fishermen returned to port with loaded smacks they found a market and ready-money for what they had to sell in the religious houses. After the dissolution this market was suddenly withdrawn and the fisheries declined.†

* See in Blunt's "Reformation," p. 385, the plain words of Latimer on this subject.

† B. Mus. Arund. MS., 151, f. 386. The author, who wrote about the year 1557, says: "Post fœdam illam monasteriorum stragem non ovorum solum et piscium sed omnium utique rerum venalium pretium quadruplo quam antea increvit. Nec obscura est causa, si audire vacat. Antea piscatores qui longam peregrin-

If the effects of the dissolution were felt to operate in prejudice to the material comfort of the people, the blow inflicted on higher interests was still more fatal. Of course, as regards religion itself the Protestant must be bound to consider that, however grievously spiritual interests may have suffered, yet the substitution of Protestantism for Catholicity outweighs all other considerations. But learning, sacred and secular, is a more neutral ground, on which both Catholic and Protestant may meet. Deterioration was felt in all grades of education, from the university downwards. The rise in rents, says Latimer, prevented the yeoman sending his son to school. Most of the schools, at this time, were closed, without any provision being made for a substitute. Moreover, the monasteries and convents had supported scholars at the universities, or provided for

nationem inierant, non ad Islandiam solum, Norwegiamve, sed ad ipsos interdum antipodes, si quando piscibus onusta navigia retulissent, parata illis in monasteriis erat pecunia, neque unquam in tam malignas nundinas inciderunt quin lucrum abunde facerent. . . . Sed postquam cœnobiis solitudo venit neque ulla deinceps hospitalitas familiare ibi ali cœpit, nisi quæ pastori uni et cano- ufferet, sed et prohibitis insuper diebus (jejunii) omnia passim cœperunt comedi (libertate nimirum Evangelica prodita), piscatoribus statim perpetuæ feriæ indictæ fuerunt." Later changes, of course, brought the evil to the point of a public calamity; a fact to which the grotesque instructions, which Elizabeth often required to be conveyed to the people through her bishops, to eat fish on certain days give abundant witness, just as the warning given to instruct the people that they were not to eat fish as fasting fare, but with a view to trade, is sufficient evidence of a desire to avert the sinister interpretation of the sectary on the order.

young clerics until their ordination, when they supplied them with a title. This change was felt immediately. At Cambridge the scholars, in 1545, petitioned king Henry for privileges, as they feared the destruction of monasteries would altogether annihilate learning.* At Oxford, as is well known, the result was no less fatal, and for a time these great homes of learning were threatened with nothing less than ruin. At the very moment of the suppression the danger was foreseen, and to meet the case it was enjoined that every clergyman beneficed to the amount of £100 a year or more should find "an exhibition to maintain one scholar or more, either at grammar schools or at one of the universities." It is, however, clear that this injunction had no more effect than that laid on the new owners of monastic lands to keep up the hospitality always maintained by their predecessors.

Looking back from the days of Edward VI. to the times before the suppression, bishop Latimer exclaimed: "In those days what did they when they helped the scholars? Marry! they maintained and gave them livings that were very papists and professed the pope's doctrine; and now that the knowledge of God's Word is brought to light, and many earnestly study and labour to set it forth, now almost no man helpeth to maintain them."

"Truly," he said, in another sermon, "it is a pitiful thing to see schools so neglected; every true

* Fuller's "Hist. of the University of Cambridge."

Christian ought to lament the same . . . to consider what hath been plucked from abbeys, colleges and chantries, it is marvel no more to be bestowed upon this holy office of salvation. It may well be said by us that the Lord complaineth by His prophet . . . ' My house ye have deserted, and ye run everyone to his own house.' . . . Schools are not maintained; scholars have not exhibitions. . . . Very few there be that help poor scholars. . . . It would pity a man's heart to hear that, that I hear of the state of Cambridge; what it is in Oxford I cannot tell. . . . I think there be at this day (A.D. 1550) ten thousand students less than were within these twenty years and fewer preachers."*

So far as Oxford is concerned, "most of the halls and hostels," writes Anthony Wood, "were left empty. Arts declined and ignorance began to take place again."†

It is vain to speculate on what might have been. But it is certain that the progress of sound learning represented by such men as Warham, More, Colet and their friends was arrested. In view of the monasteries as they actually were and the tendencies clearly perceptible among some of the most important in the last decades of their existence, what might not have been hoped from them for the pro-

* Quoted by Blunt, p. 387. For the state of affairs in Elizabeth's reign see W. Harrison's "Description of England," written in 1577 (ed. New Shakespeare Society, p. 77, etc.).

† "Hist. and Antiquities of University of Oxford," ed. Gutch, ii., p. 67.

motion of letters had events been allowed to take their natural course? It might be objected, although there is no ground in the facts to countenance such an objection,* that the monasteries could have had no part in this new movement. But objectors such as these fail to take into account the capacity of the monastic order to adapt itself to new circumstances, and that wonderful recuperative power, which is one of the most prominent as it is one of the most interesting features of monastic history.

It may suffice to adduce a single example. At the close of the sixteenth century the Benedictine monasteries of France were in a condition which can only be described as deplorable. An attempt had been made at reform, but the houses which had joined Chezal Benoist might be counted on the fingers of one hand; the attempt had ended in failure. But within less than half-a-century the congregations of Saint Maur and Saint Vannes extended from one end of the country to the other. They numbered nearly two hundred monasteries, and the foundations were already firmly laid for what is one of the greatest and purest literary and religious glories of modern times.

One other serious result of the monastic suppression cannot be passed over without some notice. A large proportion of the conventual revenues were derived from parochial tithes impropriated to monas-

* Compare the remarks of Dr. Jessopp, "Visitations of the Diocese of Norwich" (Camden Society), p. xxviii.

teries and convents. However great an abuse it may be considered to transfer such dues from one object to another, these tithes were granted in the first instance for charitable and other strictly ecclesiastical purposes. On the suppression of the religious houses no distinction was made between monastic revenues derived from this source and from the ordinary estates. Tithes were thus granted away and sold like the fee simple of the land to laymen, and converted altogether to secular purposes. "These impropriations were in no one instance, I believe," writes Hallam, "restored to the parochial clergy, and have passed either into the hands of laymen, or of bishops and other ecclesiastical persons who were frequently compelled by the Tudor princes to take them in exchange for lands."*

"By having these parsonages," writes Spelman, "they (the lay impropiators) are charged with cure of souls; and make themselves subject to the

* "Constitutional Hist.," ed. 10th, i., p. 77. In the diocese of Norwich, according to Taylor (*Index Monasticus*, p. xxvi.) there passed into the royal hands 221 endowments. Of these only 13 were again invested in the Church, and 11 of them had been previously annexed to the see in exchange for half its revenues. Out of 96 endowments belonging to colleges, etc. (exclusive of 10 alien priories) 80 were granted to lay proprietors. Out of a total of 256 endowments confiscated by Henry in the diocese, four-fifths, or 184, were sold or granted to laity. It has been calculated that Henry VIII. "sold or gave away the tithes of 5,000 parishes, together with those belonging to 2,374 free chapels and chantries, 110 hospitals and 90 colleges," and that at the present time, while the Church is possessed of tithes to the amount of £3,413,697, as much as £2,404,233 is held, either directly or indirectly, by impropiators.

burden that lieth so heavily upon the head of every minister, to see the service of God performed, the people instructed, the poor relieved: for to these three ends and the maintenance of ministers were parsonages instituted; as not only the canons of the Church but the books of the law and particularly the statutes of 15 Richard II. cap. 6 and 4 Henry IV. cap. 12 do manifestly testify. And no man may have them but to these purposes, neither were they otherwise given to the king by the statute of dissolution than in as large and ample a manner as the governors of those religious houses had them, nor by him conveyed otherwise to his subjects. For *nemo potest plus juris in alium transferre quam ipse habet.*"* Thus the tithes passed to the lay grantees of Henry, together with all their burdens and responsibilities. It is to be feared that no such duties have been recognized by the possessors of this ecclesiastical property which thus practically was lost to the Church at the dissolution.

Such are some of the momentous social results of that great event. They may be summed up in a few words. The creation of a large class of poor to whose poverty was attached the stigma of crime; the division of class from class, the rich mounting up to place and power, the poor sinking to lower depths; destruction of custom as a check upon the exactions of landlords; the loss by the

* "De non temerandis Ecclesiis," English works, ed. 1723, p. 15.

poor of those foundations at schools and universities intended for their children, and the passing away of ecclesiastical tithes into the hands of lay owners.*

It has become habitual with many persons to regard the greatness of the Elizabethan era as in some way rendered possible only by the dissolution of the monasteries. By this the national energies are vaguely supposed to have now first obtained a fair field and fair play. That society should have resettled itself, and a new and great day should have dawned is nothing wonderful. The constitution of human society appears to be such as never to lose the power of recreating itself on a new basis, however desperate the condition to which it may be for a time reduced. Out of revolution order once more will surely be evolved, however much may have been irretrievably lost in the cataclysm which suddenly

* Regrets are sometimes expressed that at least a distinction was not made between colleges of secular clergy, the hospitals, chantries and other eleemosynary foundations, and the religious houses properly so called. The distinction between these two classes of institutions seems to be clear to the minds of many persons in these days, but only because the real state of the case is misapprehended. In fact, all alike formed parts of one great system, the religious house was an eleemosynary foundation, and the hospital a house of prayer. It was impossible in practice to those who had the actual working of this system before their eyes to make the distinction sought to be instituted in later days. The voice of such a one as Latimer was as the voice of the solitary crying in the desert, and only serves to make it more clear how fatal and disastrous was the nature of the current which swept away all, and could sweep away no less than all, monasteries, hospitals, churches, colleges, chantries, into one common vortex of ruin.

arrested a natural and normal development. It is in no spirit of concession to a sentimental and sterile feeling of regret for a dead past that it is desired to bring home the fact that the dissolution of the monasteries did inflict a terrible blow on the social state and made life harder for the nation at large. It is always an advantage to know the truth and to learn how to face it. Besides, the past has ever its lesson for the present, and to know how grievous was the deception in the bright promises of national happiness and individual prosperity which the distribution of so noble a prize was to secure, may have its lessons even in our own day.

The last abbot of Westminster had passed away before this new England came fully on the stage of history. After striving with voice and pen to avert the calamity of the imposition of the new religion, he remained for seven-and-twenty years in more or less honourable custody. The record of these last years, though meagre, is not unworthy of the order of which he was the representative. They were marked by a gentleness and all-embracing charity, and a thoughtfulness for the needs of others, public and private. Wherever abbot Feckenham went he left marks of his beneficence, for men knowing his character were sure that their alms would be well bestowed when passing through his hands. At Holborn he would encourage the city youth in their manly games. At Bath he repaired for the poor the

ancient baths which, since the dissolution of the monastery, had been allowed to fall into ruin. Confined at length at Wisbeach, he made a causeway across the difficult fen country, and in his last will he remembered the poor who lived near the dismantled walls of his old abbey of Evesham. His zeal for religion he never dissembled, and gave evidence of it in writings and in deeds, but his words and actions were ever characterized by Christian mildness. Even in days which must have been to him full of bitterness and sorrow he never lost that interest in the public good which had been for centuries the mark of Englishmen of his profession.

There are those who believe that his long life of prayer and beneficence did not fail to bring its special blessing, and to secure the fulfilment of the dearest desire of his heart—that the name and place of his brethren might not die out from among our people. It was thirty years after Feckenham's death when the last survivor of his house of Westminster, Dom Sigebert Buckley, handed on to younger successors the holy habit, and thus secured the perpetuation of an ancient line. Nor did this old man pass away before, side by side with the now famous English seminary, a community of Benedictines, Englishmen, had gathered together, leading the old life under their own roof-tree, but as exiles in a foreign land.



APPENDIX.





APPENDIX I.

LIST of monasteries and convents which obtained the royal grant to remain undissolved, and the sums acknowledged by the treasurer of the Court of Augmentation as received for the license. The dates of the various grants are found on the Patent Rolls, and the sums paid on the Treasurer's Rolls (R. O. Exch. Augt. Off. Treasurer's Roll, i. mm. 4 d, 5).

	<i>Date of Grant.</i>		<i>£</i>	<i>s.</i>	<i>d.</i>
Albaland 25 April, 1537	payment to king	400	0	0
Alnwick 30 January, "	"	200	0	0
Arthington 11 March, "				
Beauvale 2 January, "	"	166	13	4
Bindon 16 November, 1536	"	300	0	0
Bitlesden 17 August, "	"	133	6	8
Brusyard 4 July, 1537	"	20	0	0
Burnham 9 July, "				
Canonleigh 30 January, 1537	"	200	0	0
Chatteris 17 August, "				
Chester, S. Mary's...	30 January, "	"	160	0	0
Cokehill 5 March, "				
Cokersand 19 December, 1536				
Coventry Charter-					
house 6 July, 1537	"	20	0	0
Croxden 2 July, "	"	100	0	0
Dale 30 January, 1537	"	166	13	4
Delapray (Northamp-					
ton) 13 December, 1536	"	266	13	4
Denny 28 August, "				

Appendix.

			£	s.	d.
Eggleston 30 January, 1537				
Grace Dieu (Lincoln)	17 August, 1536				
Hampall 11 March, 1537				
Hevening 27 November, 1536				
Hull Charterhouse...	28 August, ,, payment to king	233	6	8	
Hulton 1 October, ,, ,,	66	13	4	
Huntingdon 17 August, ,, ,,	133	6	8	
Keldhome 14 December, ,,				
me 2 September, ,,	200	0	0	
Launde 30 January, 1537				
Laycock 30 January, ,,	300	0	0	
broke 8 January, ,,	53	6	8	
rick 9 September, 1536				
ie 30 January, 1537				
ham 4 July, ,,	150	0	0	
Newcastle, St. Bar-					
tholomew's 30 March, ,,				
Newstead 2 January, ,,	233	6	8	
Northampton, St.					
James'	333	6	8	
Pollesloe 30 January, ,,	400	0	0	
Pollesworth 30 January, ,,	50	0	0	
Repton 12 June, 1536	266	13	4	
Roucester 11 March, 1537	100	0	0	
Shap 16 November, 1536	266	13	4	
Stafford St. Thomas'	4 July, 1537	133	6	8	
Stixwold 9 July, 1536	21	13	4	
Strathfoure 30 January, 1537	66	13	4	
Studley 30 January, ,,				
Swine 10 October, 1536				
Tutbury 3 May, 1537				
Wallingwells 10 April, ,,	66	13	4	
Winchester, St. Mary's	17 August, 1536	333	6	3	
Wollescrot 30 January, 1537	166	13	4	
Wormesley...	... 27 January, ,,	200	0	0	

APPENDIX II.

EXAMPLE of a corrody at Bridlington Priory.—
(R. O. Exch. Augmentation Off. Misc. Bk., 237, p.
73.)

“This indenture at Bridlington the 26th day of September, in the year of our Lord a thousand five hundred, thirty and three, witnesseth that we William, Prior of the Monastery of Bridlington, within the diocese of York and the convent of the same, by our whole and deliberate assent and consent, have given and granted, and by these presents for us and our successors do give and grant unto Sir Christopher Taylor, clerk and parson of Swafeld within the diocese of Lincoln and his assigns, during the natural life of the said Sir Christopher Taylor parson, one corrody; otherwise called, one *canon right*. That is to say: eight wheat loaves every week to be received at the convent cellar: Also six gallons of the convent ale and two gallons of the small ale, to be received at the brew-house at every coming: Also every day a breakfast of beef, with his ‘brews’ scalded, if he saved them, as other brethren in the same place have, with such a mess of flesh or fish, as is served to the brethren in the refectory, otherwise called the ‘frater,’ to be received daily at the convent kitchen, sodden or raw at the pleasure of the said Sir Christopher Taylor parson or his assigns. And, whenever the aforesaid convent shall be served also in their frater or refectory with double course, as their custom is, then the aforesaid Sir Christopher Taylor parson and his assigns during his natural life as above is mentioned shall receive and be served with double course: And that, as well of fish as flesh, cordial, potages and other pittances, of the provision of the sub-cellarer for the time being.

“ And, if it fortune at any time or times the said Sir Christopher Taylor parson or his assigns to take his mutton raw to the intent to reserve it towards his supper; then we will that the pottager of the convent kitchen for the time being, when he maketh the convent's pottage, shall seeth or boil the same in his pottage pot, so often as he shall be desired by the aforesaid Sir Christopher Taylor parson or his assigns, during his natural life as is above mentioned.

“ Also, the above said prior and convent, for them and their successors have granted to the abovesaid Sir Christopher Taylor parson or his assigns, one chamber in their fore court called the ‘ steward's clerk's chamber,’ with the little house under the stairs or grades of the same, late in the occupation of Thomas Brigham, Esq.: The reparations of the said chamber always reserved to the aforesaid prior and convent or their successors during the natural life of the abovesaid Sir Christopher Taylor parson.

“ Also the above said Sir Christopher Taylor parson and his assigns are granted sufficient pasturage for two horses, in summer to be pastured within their pastures, and also sufficient horsemeat in the winter for one horse, to be stabled, found and kept in the aforesaid prior's stable, or his successors', during the natural life of the abovesaid Sir Christopher Taylor parson.

“ To have and to hold the abovesaid corrody or ‘ canon right, with all the appurtenances above expressed, in manner and form above mentioned, to the abovesaid Sir Christopher Taylor parson and his assigns, from the day of the making of this present indenture to the end and term of the natural life of the aforesaid Sir Christopher Taylor, parson of Swafield.”



...

...

...

...

APPENDIX III.

THE following is a summary showing approximately the various sums of money received by the Augmentation Office from the dissolution of the monastic houses, etc.; also roughly how the money thus obtained was spent. To this is added a summary of the accounts of the treasurer of the royal jewel chamber, showing the value of the plate of the religious houses and churches, and the way it was disposed of by the royal orders. The first part is obtained from the Rolls of the Treasurer of the Court of Augmentation, the second from the account of Sir John Williams, keeper of the royal jewels, printed by the Abbotsford Club. The words "approximately" and "roughly" are used because in the troublesome task of dealing with the mass of figures on the Rolls, it is possible, even probable, that error may have crept in here or there; but it is believed that such error is not considerable enough to detract in any way from the substantial correctness of the subjoined statement.

ACCOUNT OF THE TREASURER OF THE COURT OF AUGMENTATION.
From the 24th April, 1536, to Michaelmas, 1547.

<i>Receipts.</i>				£	s.	d.
Revenue from monastic lands	415,005	6	10 $\frac{1}{2}$
Paid by religious for royal license to continue	5,948	6	8
Sales of monastic lands by king	855,751	18	5
Sales of woods	634	6	6
Fines paid by tenants for new leases	4,529	9	10 $\frac{1}{2}$
Sales of ornaments, vestments, lead, bells, furniture, buildings, etc....	26,502	1	0 $\frac{1}{4}$
Deductions from religious pensions as a forced loan to the king	9,443	15	6
Loan to king for war purposes from the re- ligious and clergy	12,870	16	8
Payments by collectors and other officers for royal leave to be free from military service	5,776	7	8 $\frac{1}{2}$
Miscellaneous: Arrears of collectors, etc.	1,979	19	11 $\frac{1}{4}$
Total receipts				1,338,442	9	2 $\frac{1}{2}$
<i>Disbursements.</i>				£	s.	d.
Fees and wages	14,444	3	4 $\frac{1}{2}$
Annuities	25,039	6	5 $\frac{1}{2}$
Pensions to religious	33,045	5	8 $\frac{1}{2}$
Office expenses	11,067	19	3 $\frac{1}{2}$
Value of plate handed to king	11,393	12	11 $\frac{1}{2}$
Purchase of lands	51,749	9	9 $\frac{1}{2}$
Payment of debts	12,909	1	9 $\frac{1}{2}$
Plate purchased for presents	14,619	12	10 $\frac{1}{2}$
War expenses:—General	238,078	5	3 $\frac{1}{4}$
Foreign	136,631	17	6 $\frac{1}{2}$
Guns and munitions of war	171,819	17	11
Naval matters: Ships and provisions	27,922	3	5 $\frac{1}{2}$
Coast fortifications	64,485	4	3 $\frac{1}{2}$
Spent by king on royal palaces	61,014	11	5
Expenses of Prince Edward of Wales in house- hold matters, etc.	23,000	0	0
Royal household expenses and money for king's use	274,086	19	8 $\frac{3}{4}$
To secure the surrender of the abbey of Abingdon	600	0	0
Various expenses, chiefly military and naval...	57,135	3	2
Total disbursements				1,229,042	14	11 $\frac{3}{4}$
Balance*				109,399	14	2 $\frac{3}{4}$
				1,338,442	9	2 $\frac{1}{2}$

* Of this £109,399 14s. 2 $\frac{3}{4}$ d no less than £76,141 8s. 3d. was still due for lands which had been sold.

ACCOUNT OF SIR JOHN WILLIAMS FOR PLATE RECEIVED IN ROYAL
JEWEL HOUSE.

<i>Receipts.</i>				£	s.	d.
Gold plate, 14,531 $\frac{3}{4}$ ounces, worth	19,016	2	6
Gilt plate, 129,520 ounces, worth	21,258	15	6 $\frac{1}{4}$
Parcel gilt plate, 73,774 $\frac{3}{4}$ ounces,* worth	11,942	10	2 $\frac{1}{4}$
Parcel gilt and white plate, 4,341 $\frac{1}{4}$ ounces, worth	795	17	11
Silver plate, 67,600 $\frac{1}{4}$ ounces, worth	10,518	8	11 $\frac{1}{2}$
Total value of plate†				63,531	15	1
In money from spoils, etc.	15,156	7	2 $\frac{1}{2}$
Ditto	ditto	393	14	1
Total receipts				79,081	16	4 $\frac{1}{2}$
<i>Disbursements.</i>				£	s.	d.
Plate bought for the king	4,849	6	6 $\frac{3}{4}$
“New trimming images of gold”	6,015	15	7 $\frac{1}{4}$
Expenses of Anne of Cleves	3,078	7	7
Money coined and sent to Ireland	10,285	8	4
King's parks	441	7	0
Purchase of manor of Ashill	1,000	0	0
Coast fortifications	9,933	6	8
Office expenses and sundries	1,023	10	0
Given to the king's “own hand” in plate and money‡	41,913	17	10 $\frac{1}{2}$
Total disbursements				78,540	19	7 $\frac{1}{2}$
Balance				540	16	9
				79,081	16	4 $\frac{1}{2}$

* The value, £6,942 10s. 1 $\frac{1}{4}$ d., given in the print of the Abbotsford Club is obviously wrong in this item.

† Large deductions are made from the values for the weights of the precious stones set in the metal and also for the wax, paper and cement found in the process of melting.

‡ This item is given as £46,636 1s. 1 $\frac{1}{4}$ d., but the total of £78,540 19s. 7 $\frac{1}{2}$ d. makes the account inaccurate, and this item is diminished so as to secure the total. The treasurer pleads that when the keeper's house in London was burnt down he lost £2,000 at least.

APPENDIX IV.

THE HOLY BLOOD OF HAYLES.

THE following portion of a letter from the abbot of Hayles to Crumwell, upon the subject of the celebrated relic preserved in his abbey, is of considerable interest. It anticipates in a curious way suggestions of trickery and deceit on the part of his monks actually made by subsequent writers:—

“It is not unknown unto your honour how that there is in the monastery of Hayles a ‘blood,’ which hath been reputed as a miracle a great season. And now I come to tell your lordship plainly that I have a conscience putting me in dread lest idolatry be committed therein, giving the very honour of the blood of Christ to that thing, which I cannot tell what it is. And, having this conscience I was and am wonderously perplexed: for to put it away of my own private authority, seeing it hath been allowed there to be showed to such as seek for it, I feared (to do) lest I should condemn myself to be guilty in misusing of it, as changing and renewing it with drakes blood, wherein I offer myself to suffer the most shameful death that ever man suffered if ever it may be proved that it was either changed, renewed or ever looked upon to try what it is, to my knowledge, but is there still, as far as ever I can learn or know, as it was brought thither. And, there is one monk alive nigh eighty years of age, who hath kept it almost forty years. And he will (as he says) upon his life make the same answer. And for

discharge of my conscience in avoiding of idolatry and to save my honesty towards the world I do most earnestly beseech your honour to send hither your commission by whom it shall please you to examine my truth and honesty in this matter upon danger not only of my office and suppression, but also of my life, if I be found guilty in any word that I have said; and then further, by your authority, to order that blood that it may be no more noted to minister occasion of idolatry."—R. O. State Papers, Dom., 1538,
^v
383.

The rest of the story may be taken from the Appendix to Hearne's "Benedict of Peterborough" (p. 751, *et seq.*). In reply to the above communication the king's commission to examine the relic was, on October 4th, 1538, directed to bishop Latimer, the prior of Worcester, and the abbot. On the 28th of the same month they went together with Richard Tracy, Esq., to the abbey and viewed, as they say in their certificate to Crumwell, "a certain supposed relic called the blood of Hayles, which was enclosed with a round beryl, garnished and bound on every side with silver, which we caused to be opened in the presence of a great multitude of people. And the said supposed relic we caused to be taken out of the said beryl and have viewed the same being within a little glass. And (we) also tried the same according to our powers wits and discretions by all means and by force of the view and other trials thereof we think deem and judge the substance and matter of the said supposed relic to be an unctuous gum coloured, which being in the glass appeared to be glistening red, resembling partly the colour of

blood. And after we did take out part of the said substance and matter out of the glass then it was apparent glistering yellow colour like amber or base gold, and doth cleave to as gum or birdlime."

On November 24th, 1538, as Holinshed relates (p. 946), "the bishop of Rochester (John Hilsey) preached at Paul's Cross and there showed the blood of Hayles and affirmed the same to be no blood but honey clarified and coloured with saffron, as it had been evidently proved before the king and his council."

Baker follows this account *verbatim*. Speed says "time proved it a mere counterfeit;" but in the same book, speaking of the relic of Christ's blood at Ashridge College, in Buckinghamshire (really the larger of two portions of the same great relic), he gives the same account as Holinshed does of the Hayles relic. Holinshed does not disagree with the report of the commissioners, but "is more particular."

Later historians, however, take a different line which cannot and does not agree with the real facts. In substance the story, variously embellished according to the taste and inventive faculties of the narrator, is this:—The Holy Blood, which by the trickery of the monks was considered to be invisible to a man in mortal sin, was really the blood of a duck renewed every week. It was kept in a crystal, very thick on the one side and thin and transparent on the other. If it was a wealthy person who had to

confess the thick side was turned to him, and when he had paid for a sufficient number of masses, "one in a secret place behind the altar, near which the relic was placed, turned the thin side, and then the blood appeared."

This account is given by lord Herbert and Burnet on the authority of William Thomas's "*Il Pellegrino Inglese*." Fox, in his "Acts," declares, probably on the same authority, that the relic was proved "at Paul's Cross to be the blood of a duck." Collier discredits the story, while Fuller says that it was the blood of a duck, but gives another account of this wonderful imposture. According to him, the blood by some ingenious contrivance "strangely spirted or sprang up, to the great amazement of common people."

What Thomas does say is interesting. The relic was brought, he tells his readers, "many years agone out of the holy land of Jerusalem," and adds, "see here the craft of these devilish soulquellers." For "these monks," he writes "(for there were two specially and secretly appointed to this office) every Saturday killed a duck and renewed therewith this consecrated blood: as they themselves confessed not only in secret, but also openly before an approved audience." We may note that even in Thomas there is no authority for Fuller's ingenious embellishment.

It will be seen, therefore, that the Protestant faith, no less than the Catholic, has its legends and

legendary growths. Holinshed (p. 275) gives an accurate account of the first coming of the relic. The annalist of the house of Hayles, who was contemporary of the event which he chronicles, writes under the year 1267 in regard to his founders and patrons (Pertz, *Scriptt.* xvi., p. 483) that it was they who enriched the abbey with the relic. According to the habits of mind in those days it was natural that the founders of a religious house, especially of that in which they hoped to find a mortal resting place, should seek to enrich such a foundation with some notable relic. Richard of Cornwall, the founder, was king of the Romans, and he and his son Edmund were in a position to obtain in Germany, for such an object, even a relic held in the highest veneration. We may be quite sure that for the great relics of their houses of Hayles and Ashridge they would do the best that in them lay. I have been unable to identify the locality from which Edmund obtained the relic. It is called by the monk of Hayles Doilaunde (so the MS.; Pertz prints Dilaunde), but in all probability he never saw this name written, but took it down from the lips of others. Still, we may, with great probability, conjecture that the relic of the Holy Blood, obtained by the earl of Cornwall, was one of the numerous relics, the spoils of the imperial chapels and great sanctuaries of Constantinople, brought into Germany after the sack of that city by the Latins in the year 1204. It may be mentioned that

Conrad von Krosigk, bishop of Halberstadt, one of the chiefs of the Latin host, brought back as apparently the chief among the numerous relics obtained by him "*Sanguis Domini Nostri Jhesu Christi*," till then preserved in the church of St. Sophia; and this relic was not among those which on his resignation of the see in 1208, he bestowed on his cathedral (see Riant, "*Exuviæ Sacræ Constantinopolitanæ*" i., p. 20, ii., pp. 84-85, and Riant, "*Dépouilles religieuses*," etc., in "*Mém. de la Soc. des Antiquaires de France*," xxxvi., p. 192).

Knowing thus how the relic was obtained by the monastery, and that, whatever may be thought of the blood, the relic and reliquary were known to the monks of Hayles as a venerated trust and memorial of their founders, there can be no doubt among reasonable men that the object which was opened and examined by Latimer, the prior of Worcester, and the abbot of Hayles was the same which had been placed in the monastery by Edmund of Cornwall and his father, and that it was no "craft of devilish soulquellers."

Much the same may be said of another venerated tradition which has long prevailed concerning the "Rood of Boxley." See the whole of this question dealt with and the evidence drawn out at length in an article by the Rev. F. Bridgett, entitled "How a Lie Grows," in the *Dublin Review*, 1887.

APPENDIX V.

INDEX TO THE MAPS.

The map in the first volume showed the houses of the four great orders of friars, and those of the Carthusians.

The four following maps show the distribution of the English houses :—

I. of Black monks (Benedictines, Cluniacs) ;

II. of White monks (Cistercians) ;

III. of Regular canons, Black (Augustinian), and White (Premonstratensian) ; and

IV. the Nunneries.

They are designed to represent the state of the different orders in the reign of Henry VIII., and do not include houses which were suppressed or died out before 1509.

Even so, these maps are not a complete presentment of the religious houses in England at the time of the suppression. The houses of the Trinitarian and Crutched Friars, the Bonhommes, and a few others (some thirty in all), to say nothing of the establishments of the Knights of St. John, are not given. There is also a much more considerable omission. No account is taken of the hospitals served by a community, sometimes numerous, of canons or sisters generally observing the rule of St. Austin. It may fairly be objected that a plan must be very defective which should fail to include a community (to take a modern instance) of the same kind as that of the Austin nuns of the Hotel Dieu of Rouen, counting centuries of honoured existence. But, in the first place, the maps are only intended to illustrate this book. And, secondly, the perfectly legitimate dissatisfaction of the antiquary or inquirer at the somewhat arbitrary rule of exclusion here adopted may help to bring home the difficulty adverted to p. 524 *ante*, which must have made it next to impossible in practice, when once the destruction of the monasteries was determined on, to draw a sharp line between monastic and charitable foundations.

It is hoped before long, however, to meet a want long felt by issuing a handy historical atlas of ancient ecclesiastical England which shall show the alien priories and destroyed monasteries, as

well as those suppressed by Henry VIII., together with hospitals and even chantries; and include references to the Ministers' Accounts, and similar documents. Such an atlas, to be of real value, must be based on the records of the Augmentation Office, etc., of which so much use has been made in this book. Considerable progress has been already made in gathering the necessary materials.

In the following index the numerous aliases have been passed over. Cells have been ranged under the monasteries to which they belonged, but a cross reference is given at its proper place in the general alphabetical list.

A few remarks are necessary on the question of "cells." The word "cell" is familiar to antiquaries; but it may be doubted if there are many who (beyond the general idea that it implies dependence as against autonomy) are prepared to answer with any precision the question: What is a "cell?" and what makes this house a "cell" and that one not? Is it necessary to the idea of a "cell" that those who live in it should be professed monks of the mother house, or may they be professed for the dependent house in which they actually live? In other words, are the monks of the "cell" removable or not? Is it necessary the prior should be dative and removable, or dative only and not removable; or may he be elective of the professed of the so-called cell, and only presented to the bishop for confirmation by the superior of the mother-house? Is the fact that a yearly pension is the only apparent connection between the two houses enough to settle that the house so paying pension is not a cell? May a house which was started as a cell have ceased at the suppression to be one, though no direct documentary evidence can be produced on the point? Is an establishment still to be considered a "cell" where the "mansion-house" is inhabited by one or two "parish priests" serving the parish church, or perhaps a bailiff, whilst the revenue and title of prior are conferred on some senior or emeritus of the parent monastery, who in all probability may not regularly reside at the "cell?" These are some of the questions which arise in compiling such a list as the following (which includes, by the way, at least one example of this last class).

The case of the Cluniacs has special features of its own. The word "cell" among them had its special meaning, and implied much the same system as the paternity system among the Cistercians and White Canons (Premonstratensians). The Black Canons

followed the freer, and, so to speak, more generous plan of the Benedictines proper, which though it maintained a central bond in their general chapter, yet left each house a real autonomy, allowed it full scope for its own natural development, and did not aim at bringing all to a common level, which, so long as monks are men, will, in the long run, ever tend to be the level of the lower, not the aspiration for the higher. The difference of the two systems explains how, when once decadence fairly set in, all efforts to bring back the orders of Cluny and Cîteaux to better things have been, speaking broadly, unsuccessful; whilst the history of the mere Benedictines—that “organization, diverse, complex, irregular and variously ramified, rich rather than symmetrical, with many origins and centres and new beginnings, and the action of local influences, like some great natural growth”—is, if a story of continual failure to maintain themselves at the level of their own ideal, yet a story of a perpetual, a persistent, a varied and multiform renewal.

As to the organization of the English Cluniacs in the reign of Henry VIII. we are quite in the dark, although Sir G. F. Duckett's *Cluni Charters and Records* has thrown much light on their history generally. Unfortunately the document settling the relations of the English houses to Lewes, which is the necessary complement of the bull of Sixtus IV. freeing that house from its subjection to Cluny (Duckett, ii., 92), is not at present forthcoming. In all probability, however, this settlement would be on the lines of the “*Memorie misse per priores Anglie, que sunt una magna fatuitas*” (*ibid.*, ii., 22-24), drawn up about 1415. Long before this there seem to have been irregularities; for instance, the priors of Daventry and Monk Bretton, though these were certainly Cluniac houses, appear as belonging to the General Chapter of the Benedictines proper. The Cluniac “cells” are in the list below reduced to a very small number; and not merely such great houses as Castleacre, but even Torkesley and Wangford are treated as conventual priories.

The reasons for the treatment of individual cases cannot be here developed; but it may be well to say that the list has been drawn up with a wish rather to keep to the lines of existing antiquarian tradition, so to speak, than to introduce novelties, and that that tradition has accordingly not been departed from in any instance without, as it seemed, necessity. The whole subject is one which well deserves examination. The question whether such and such

a house was a "cell" or not was, at a given moment in Henry's reign, a point of practical importance (see Vol. ii., p. 18); it is hardly to be expected that if the point was not clear then without inspection of records it will be patent and obvious three and a half centuries later. Examination of new material is required. Dr. Jessopp's recent volume of "Visitations" has been decisive in some cases where aid has been sought for in the "Monasticon" in vain.

The Gilbertine houses are all included in the map of the nunneries, although some of the smaller among them certainly were inhabited by canons only.

The following are the abbreviations used in the first column of the Index of the maps:—

A.	=	Austin canons.
A(n)	=	„ nuns.
A(Sep).	=	„ canons of the Holy Sepulchre.
B.	=	Benedictine monks.
B(n).	=	„ nuns.
Bridg.	=	Bridgettines.
C.	=	Cistercian monks.
C(n).	=	„ nuns.
Cl.	=	Cluniac monks.
Cl(n).	=	„ nuns.
Dom(n).	=	Dominican nuns.
Fr(n)	=	Franciscan nuns.
G.	=	Gilbertines (canons following the rule of St. Austin and nuns that of St. Benedict).
P.	=	Premonstratensian canons
P(n).	=	„ nuns.

LIST OF HOUSES.

ORDER.	HOUSE.	COUNTY.	REFER- ENCE TO MAP.
B.	Abbotsbury abb.	Dorset	I C f.
C.	Aberconway abb.	Denbigh	II B c.
B.	Abergavenny pr.	Monmouth	I C e.
B.	Abingdon abb.	Berks	I D e.
A(n)	Aconbury	Hereford	IV C d.
P.	Agatha's, St., abb.	York	III Db.
A.	Ailsham pr.	Lincoln	III E c.
B.	Albans, St. abb.	Herts	I E e.
"	cells:—Belvoir	Lincoln	" D c.
"	Binham	Norfolk	" F c.
"	Hatfield Peverell	Essex	" E e.
"	Hertford	Herts	" E e.
"	Pembroke	Pembroke	" A c.
"	Redburn	Herts	" E e.
"	Tinmouth	Northumberland	" Da.
"	Wallingford	Berks	" D c.
"	Coket Island (cell of Tinmouth)	Northumberland	" Da.
	Alcester (see Evesham)		
A.	Aldbury pr.	Surrey	III E e.
	Aldeby (see Norwich)		
P.	Alnwick abb.	Northumberland	III Da.
G.	Alvingham	Lincoln	IV E c.
B(n).	Amesbury	Wilts	IV D c.
A.	Anglesey pr.	Cambridge	III E d.
B(n).	Ankerwyke	Bucks	IV E c.
	Antony (St.) (see Plympton)		
B(n).	Arden	York	IV Db.
B(n).	Armthwaite	Cumberland	IV C a.
Cl(n).	Arthington	York	IV Db.
A.	Ashby Canons pr.	Northants	III D d.
B.	Athelney abb.	Somerset	I C e.
	Avecote (see Malvern, Great)		
	Bamburgh (see Nostell)		

ORDER.	HOUSE.	COUNTY.	REFER- ENCE TO MAP.
B.	Bardney abb.	Lincoln	I E c.
B.	Bardsey abb.	Carnarvon	I A d.
B(n).	Barking	Essex	IV E e.
P.	Barlings abb.	Lincoln	III E c.
A.	Barlynch pr.	Somerset	III B e.
Cl.	Barnstaple pr.	Devon	I B e.
A.	Barnwell pr.	Cambridge	III E d.
B(n).	Barrow Gurney	Somerset	IV C e.
C(n).	Basedale	York	IV D b.
C.	Basingwerk abb.	Flint	II C c.
B.	Bath Cath. pr.	Somerset	I C e.
„	cell:—Dunster	„	„ B e.
B.	Battle abb.	Sussex	I E f.
„	cell:—Brecknock	Brecon	„ B d.
P.	Beauchief abb.	Derby	III D c.
C.	Beaulieu abb.	Hants	II D f.
	Bees, St. (see York, St. Mary's)		
A.	Beeston pr.	Norfolk	III F d.
P.	Begham abb.	Sussex	III E e.
	Belvoir (see Albans, St.)		
B.	Benet's of Hulme, St., abb.	Norfolk	I F d.
A.	Berden pr.	Essex	III E d.
B.	Bermondsey abb.	Surrey	I E e.
„	cell:—Derby, St. James	Derby	„ D c.
A.	Bethgeleit pr.	Carnarvon	III B c.
P.	Bileigh abb.	Essex	III E e.
A.	Bilsington pr.	Kent	III F e.
C.	Bindon abb.	Dorset	II C f.
	Binham (see Albans, St.)		
B.	Birkenhead pr.	Cheshire	I C c.
A.	Bisham pr.	Berks	III D e.
C.	Bittlesden abb.	Bucks	II D d.
B(n).	Blackborough	Norfolk	IV E d.
A.	Blackmore pr.	Essex	III E e.
P.	Blanchland abb.	Northumberland	III D a.
A.	Bliburgh pr.	Suffolk	III F d.
B.	Blyth pr.	Notts	I D c.
A.	Bodmin pr.	Cornwall	III A f.
G.	Bollington	Lincoln	IV E c.
A.	Bolton abb.	York	III D b.
C.	Bordesley abb.	Worcester	II D d.
A.	Bourn abb.	Lincoln	III E d.
B.	Boxgrave pr.	Sussex	I E e.

ORDER.	HOUSE.	COUNTY.	REFER- ENCES TO MAP.
C.	Boxley abb.	Kent	II F e.
A.	Bradenstoke pr.	Wilts	III C e.
B.	Bradewell pr.	Bucks	I D d.
A.	Bradley pr.	Leicester	III D d.
	Brecknock (see Battle)		
	Bredon (see Nostell)		
A.	Bredsall pr.	Derby	III D c.
B(n).	Brewood Black Ladies	Stafford	IV D d.
C(n).	Brewood White Ladies	Salop	IV C d.
A.	Bridlington pr.	York	III E b.
A.	Brinkburne pr.	Northumber- land	III D a.
A.	Bristol, Great, St. Augustine's abb.	Gloucester	III C e.
B(n).	Bristol, St. Mary Magdalen	"	IV C e.
	Bristol, St. James's (see Tewkes- bury)		
P(n).	Brodholm	Notts	IV D c.
A.	Bromehill pr.	Norfolk	III F d.
A.	Bromere pr.	Hants	III D e.
	Bromfield (see Gloucester, St. Peter's)		
B(n).	Bromhall	Berks	IV D e.
Cl.	Bromholm pr.	Norfolk	I F d.
A.	Brooke pr.	Rutland	III E d.
C.	Bruerne abb.	Oxford	II D e.
Fr(n).	Brusyard	Suffolk	IV F d.
A.	Bruton abb.	Somerset	III C e.
A.	Buckenham pr.	Norfolk	III F d.
C.	Buckfast abb.	Devon	II B f.
C.	Buckland abb.	Devon	II B f.
A(n).	Buckland Minchin	Somerset	IV C e.
C.	Buildwas abb.	Salop	II C d.
B(n).	Bungay	Suffolk	IV F d.
A.	Burcester pr.	Oxford	III D e.
A(n).	Burnham	Bucks	IV E e.
A.	Burscough pr.	Lancaster	III C c.
B.	Burton-on-Trent abb.	Stafford	I D d.
B.	Bury St. Edmunds abb.	Suffolk	I F d.
A.	Bushmead pr.	Bedford	III E d.
A.	Butley pr.	Suffolk	III F d.
C.	Byland abb.	York	II D b

ORDER.	HOUSE.	COUNTY.	REFER- ENCE TO MAP.
C.	Caldey (see Dogmael's Fr.)		
A.	Calder abb.	Cumberland	II B b.
A.	Caldwell pr.	Bedford	III E d.
A.	Calwich pr.	Stafford	III D c.
B.	Cambridge Monks' or Buck- ingham College (now St. Mary Magdalen Coll.)	Cambridge	I E d.
G.	Cambridge, St. Edmund's	"	IV E d.
A(n).	Campsey	Suffolk	IV F d.
B(n).	Cannington	Somerset	IV C e.
A(n).	Canonleigh	Devon	IV B e.
B.	Canterbury St. Augustine's abb.	Kent	I F e.
B.	Canterbury Christ Church Cath.		
B.	pr.	Kent	I F e.
"	cells:—Dover, St. Martin's,	Kent	„ F e.
"	Oxford, Canter- bury College	Oxford	„ D e.
B(n).	Canterbury, St. Sepulchre's	Kent	IV F e.
A.	Canterbury, St. Gregory's pr.	"	III F e.
B.	Canwell pr.	Stafford	I C d.
	Cardigan (see Chertsey)		
A.	Carlisle Cath. pr.	Cumberland	III C a.
A.	Carmarthen pr.	Carmarthen	III B e.
B(n).	Carrow	Norfolk	IV F d.
	Carswell (see Montacute)		
A.	Cartmel pr.	Lancaster	III C b.
Cl.	Castleacre pr.	Norfolk	I F d.
B(n).	Catesby	Northampton	IV D d.
G.	Catterley	Lincoln	IV E c.
B.	Cerne abb.	Dorset	I C f.
A.	Chacomb pr.	Northants	III D d.
B(n).	Chatteris	Cambridge	IV E e.
B.	Chepstow	Monmouth	I C e.
B.	Chertsey abb.	Surrey	I E e.
"	cell:—Cardigan	Cardigan	„ B d.
B(n).	Cheshunt	Herts	IV E e.
B.	Chester, St. Werburgh's abb.	Cheshire	I C c.
B(n).	Chester, St. Mary's	"	IV C c.
G.	Chicksand	Beds	IV E d.
A.	Chirbury pr.	Salop	III C d.

ORDER.	HOUSE.	COUNTY.	REFERENCE TO MAP.
A.	Cirencester abb.	Gloucester	III D e.
G.	Clattercote pr.	Oxford	IV D d.
C.	Cleeve abb.	Somerset	II C e.
B(n).	Clementhorpe	York	IV D b.
B(n).	Clerkenwell	Middlesex	IV E e.
Cl.	Clifford pr.	Hereford	I C d.
C.	Coggeshall abb.	Essex	II F e.
C(n).	Cokehill	Worcester	IV D d.
P.	Cokersand abb.	Lancaster	III C b.
A.	Cokesford pr.	Norfolk	III F d.
	Coket (see Albans, St.)		
B.	Colchester, St. John's abb.	Essex	I F d.
A.	Colchester, St. Botolph's pr.	"	III F d.
B.	Colne Earls pr.	"	I F d.
C.	Combe abb.	Warwick	II D d.
C.	Combermere abb.	Cheshire	II C c.
A.	Conishead pr.	Lancaster	III C b.
A(n).	Cornworthy	Devon	IV B f.
B.	Coventry Cath. pr.	Warwick	I D d.
P.	Coverham abb.	York	III D b.
	Cowick (see Tavistock)		
A(n).	Crabhouse	Norfolk	IV E d.
	Cranborne (see Tewkesbury)		
C.	Croxden abb.	Stafford	II D c.
P.	Croxton abb.	Leicester	III D d.
"	cell :—Hornby	Lancaster	" C b.
B.	Croyland abb.	Lincoln	I E d.
"	cell :—Freston	"	" E c.
A.	Cumbwell pr.	Kent	III E e.
C.	Cwmhyre abb.	Radnor	II B d.
	Cyrus, St. (see Montacute)		
P.	Dale abb.	Derby	III D c.
A.	Darley abb.	"	III D c.
Dom(n)	Dartford	Kent	IV E e.
Cl.	Daventry pr.	Northants	I D d.
B(n).	Davington	Kent	IV F e.
	Deerhurst (see Tewkesbury)		
Fr(n).	Denny	Cambridge	IV E d.
	Deping (see Thorney)		
	Derby, St. James's (see Bermondsey)		

ORDER.	HOUSE.	COUNTY.	REFER- ENCE TO MAP.
C.	Dieulacres abb. Dodford (see Halesowen)	Stafford	II D c.
A.	Dodnash pr.	Suffolk	III F d.
B.	Dogmael's, St. abb.	Pembroke	I A d.
"	cell :—Caldey	"	" A e.
A.	Dorchester abb.	Oxford	III D e.
C.	Dore abb. Dover, St. Martin's (see Canter- bury, Christ Church)	Hereford	II C d.
A.	Drax pr.	York	III D c.
C.	Dudley (see Wenlock)		
C.	Dunkeswell abb.	Devon	II C f.
A.	Dunmow pr.	Essex	III E d.
A.	Dunstable pr. Dunster (see Bath)	Beds	III E e.
P.	Dureford abb.	Sussex	III D e.
B.	Durham Cath. pr.	Durham	I D b.
"	cells :—Farn Island	Northumberland	" D a.
"	Finchale	Durham	" D a.
"	Jarrow	"	" D a.
"	Lindisfarne	Northumberland	" D a.
"	Lytham	Lancashire	" C c.
"	Oxford, Durham College	Oxford	" D e.
"	Stamford, St. Leon- ard's	Lincoln	" E d.
"	Wearmouth	Durham	" D a.
B(n).	Easeburn	Sussex	IV D e.
P.	Egleston abb.	York	III D b.
G.	Ellerton	York	IV D b.
C(n).	Elreton	York	IV D b.
B(n).	Elstow	Beds	IV E d.
B.	Ely Cath. pr.	Cambridge	I E d.
"	cell :—Molycourt	Norfolk	I E d.
A.	Erdbury pr.	Warwick	III D d.
C(n).	Esholt	York	IV D b.
B.	Evesham abb.	Worcester	I D d.
"	cells :—Alcester	Warwick	" D d.
"	Penwortham	Lancashire	" C c.
B.	Exeter, St. Nicholas' pr.	Devon	I B f.
B.	Eye pr.	Suffolk	I F d.

ORDER.	HOUSE.	COUNTY.	REFERENCE TO MAP.
B.	Eynesham abb.	Oxford	I D e.
B(n).	Fairwell	Stafford	IV D d.
Cl.	Farleigh	Wilts	I C e.
B.	Farn Island (see Durham)		
B.	Faversham abb.	Kent	I F e.
	Felixstow (see Rochester)		
A.	Felley pr.	Notts	III D c.
A.	Ferreby (North) pr.	York	III E c.
	Finchale (see Durham)		
A.	Finneshed	Northants	III E d.
B(n).	Flamstead	Herts	IV E e.
A.	Flanesford	Hereford	III C e.
C.	Flexley abb.	Gloucester	II C e.
A.	Fritcham pr.	Norfolk	III E d.
A(n).	Flixton	Suffolk	IV F d.
B.	Folkestone pr.	Kent	I F e.
C.	Ford abb.	Devon	II C f.
G.	Fordham	Cambridge	IV E d.
B(n).	Fosse	Lincoln	IV D c.
C.	Fountains abb.	York	II D b.
	Freston (see Croyland)		
A.	Frithelstoke pr.	Devon	III B e.
C.	Furness abb.	Lancaster	II C b.
C.	Garendon abb.	Leicester	II D d.
A.	Germans St. pr.	Cornwall	III B f.
A.	Gisburn pr.	York	III C b.
B.	Glastonbury abb.	Somerset	I C e.
A.	Gloucester, St. Oswald's	Gloucester	III C e.
B.	Gloucester, St. Peter's abb.	Gloucester	I C e.
"	cells :—Bromfield	Salop	" C d.
"	Ewenny	Glamorgan	" B e.
"	Hereford, St. Guthlac's	Hereford	" C d.
"	Stanley, St. Leonards	Gloucester	" C e.
B(n).	Godstow	Oxon	IV D e.
A(n).	Goring	Oxon	IV D e.
C(n).	Goykwell	Lincoln	IV E c.
A(n).	Grace Dieu	Leicester	IV D d.
C.	Grace Dieu abb.	Monmouth	II C e.
C(n).	Greenfield	Lincoln	IV E c.

ORDER.	HOUSE.	COUNTY.	REFER- ENCE TO MAP.
A.	Greisleys pr.	Derby	III D d.
B(n).	Grimsby	Lincoln	IV E c.
B.	Grosmont pr.	York	I D b.
A.	Haghmon abb.	Salop	III C d.
P.	Hagneby abb.	Lincoln	III E c.
P.	Halesowen abb.	Worcester	III C d.
"	cell :—Dodford	"	" C d.
B(n).	Haliwell (London)	Middlesex	IV E e.
A.	Haltemprice pr.	York	III E c.
B(n).	Halystane	Northumberland	IV C a.
B(n).	Handale	York	IV D b.
C(n).	Hampole	York	IV D c.
A.	Hartland abb.	Devon	III B e.
A(n).	Harwood	Beds	IV E d.
A.	Hastings, pr.	Sussex	III E f.
B.	Hatfield Broadoak pr.	Essex	I E e.
	Hatfield Peverell (see Albans, St.)		
A.	Haverfordwest pr.	Pembroke	III A e.
G.	Haverholme	Lincoln	IV E c.
C.	Hayles abb.	Gloucester	II D e.
B(n).	Hedingham Castle	Essex	IV F d.
A.	Helagh Park pr.	York	III D b.
A.	Hempton pr.	Norfolk	III F d.
B(n).	Henwood	Warwick	IV D d.
A.	Heringfleet pr.	Suffolk	III F d.
A.	Heringham pr.	Sussex	III E e.
	Hertford (see Albans, St.)		
C(n).	Hevening	Lincoln	IV D c.
A.	Hexham pr.	Northumberland	III C a.
"	cell :—Ovingham	"	" D a.
A.	Hickling pr.	Norfolk	III F c.
B(n).	Hinchinbrook	Hunts	IV F d.
G.	Hitchin	Herts	IV E d.
B.	Holland pr.	Lancaster	I C c.
G.	Holland Brigge	Lincoln	IV E c.
C.	Holm Cultram abb.	Cumberland	II C a.
	Holme (see Montacute)		
Cl.	Horkesley Parva pr.	Essex	I F d.
	Hornby (see Croxton)		
B.	Horsham, St. Faith pr.	Norfolk	I F d.
Cl.	Horton pr.	Kent	I F e.

ORDER.	HOUSE.	COUNTY.	REFER- ENCE TO MAP.
	Horton (see Sherborne)		
	Hoxne (see Norwich Cath. pr.)		
C.	Hulton abb.	Staffs	II C c.
B.	Humberston abb.	Lincoln	I E c.
A.	Huntingdon pr.	Huntingdon	IV E d.
	Hurley (see Westminster)		
B.	Hyde abb.	Hants	I D e.
	Hyrst in Axholme (see Nostell)		
B(n).	Icklington	Cambridge	IV E d.
A.	Ipswich, Holy Trinity pr.	Suffolk	III F d.
A.	Ipswich, St. Peter's pr.	Suffolk	III F d.
P(n).	Irford	Lincoln	IV E c.
	Ives, St. (see Ramsey)		
B(n).	Ivinghoe	Bucks	IV E e.
A.	Ivychurch pr.	Wilts	III D e.
A.	Ixworth pr.	Suffolk	III F d.
	Jarrow (see Durham)		
C.	Jervaulx abb.	York	II D b.
	Keldholme	York	IV D b.
A.	Kenilworth abb.	Warwick	III D d.
	Kershall (see Lenton)		
A.	Keynsham abb.	Somerset	III C e.
	Kidwelly (see Sherborne)		
B(n).	Kilburn	Middlesex	IV E e.
B(n).	Kington	Wilts	IV C e.
C.	Kingswood abb.	Wilts	II C e.
A.	Kirkby Beller pr.	Leicestershire	III D d.
A.	Kirkham pr.	York	III D b.
C(n).	Kirklees	York	IV D c.
C.	Kirkstall abb.	York	II D c.
C.	Kirksted abb.	Lincoln	II E c.
A.	Kyme pr.	Lincoln	III E c.
C.	Kymmer abb.	Merionett	II B d.
B(?)	Kynemark, St.	Monmouth	I C e.
	Lacock abb.	Wilts	IV C e.
A.	Lacton pr.	Essex	III E e.
B(n).	Lambley	Northumberland	IV C a.
A.	Lanercost pr.	Cumberland	III C a.

ORDER.	HOUSE.	COUNTY.	REFER- ENCE TO MAP.
P.	Langdon abb.	Kent	III F e.
B(n).	Langley	Leicester	IV D d.
P.	Langley abb.	Norfolk	III F d.
A.	Lantony, New, pr.	Gloucester	III C e.
A.	Lantony, Old, pr.	Monmouth	III C e.
A.	Launceston pr.	Cornwall	III B f.
A.	Launde abb.	Leicester	III D d.
P.	Lavenden abb.	Bucks	III E d.
A.	Leedes pr.	Kent	III F e.
C(n).	Legbourne	Lincoln	IV E c.
A.	Leicester abb.	Leicester	III D d.
Cl.	Lenton pr.	Notts	I D c.
"	cell :—Kershall	Lancaster	" C c.
"	Leominster (see Reading)		
A.	Lesnes abb.	Kent	III E e.
A.	Letheringham pr.	Suffolk	III F d.
Cl.	Lewes pr.	Sussex	I F f.
"	cell :—Stanesgate	Essex	" F e.
P.	Leystone abb.	Suffolk	III F d.
A.	Lighes pr.	Essex	III F e.
B(n).	Lillechurch	Kent	IV E e.
A.	Lilleshull abb.	Salop	III C d.
G.	Lincoln, St. Catherine's	Lincoln	IV E c.
	Lincoln, St. Mary Magdalen's (see York, St. Mary's)		
	Lindisfarne (see Durham)		
B(n).	Littlemore	Oxford	IV D e.
C(n).	Llanleir	Cardigan	IV B d.
C(n).	Llanlurgan	Montgomery	IV C d.
C.	Llantarnam abb.	Monmouth	II C e.
A.	London, St. Bartholomew's pr.	Middlesex	III E e.
A.	London, Holy Trinity, Aldgate, pr.	"	III E e.
C.	London, St. Mary Graces abb.	"	II E e.
B(n).	London, St. Helen's	"	IV E e.
Fr(n).	London* the Minorities	"	IV E e.
A.	Longleat	Wilts	III C e.
C.	Louth Park abb.	Lincoln	II E c.
A(n).	Lymbrook	Hereford	IV C d.
	Lynne (see Norwich Cath. pr.)		
	Lytham (see Durham Cath. pr.)		

* For London see also Clerkenwell and Haliwell.

ORDER.	HOUSE.	COUNTY.	REFER- ENCE TO MAP.
A.	Maiden Bradley pr.	Wilts	III C e.
B(n).	Malling	Kent	IV E e.
B.	Malmesbury abb.	Wilts	I C e.
"	cell :—Pilton	Devon	" B e.
G.	Malpas (see Montacute)		
B.	Malton (Old)	York	IV D b.
B.	Malvern, Great, pr.	Worcester	I C d.
"	cell :—Avecote	Warwick	I D d.
	Malvern, Little (see Worcester Cath., pr.)		
C.	Margan abb.	Glamorgan	II B e.
C(n).	Marham	Norfolk	IV E d.
A.	Markby pr.	Lincoln	III E c.
G.	Marlborough	Wilts	IV D e.
B(n).	Marlow, Little	Bucks	IV D e.
G.	Marmond	Cambridge	V E d.
B(n).	Marryck	York	IV D b.
	Marsh, St. Mary de (see Plymp- ton)		
A.	Marton pr.	York	III D b.
	Massingham (see Westacre).		
G.	Mattersey	Notts	IV D c.
A.	Maxstoke pr.	Warwick	III D d.
C.	Meaux abb.	York	II E b.
A.	Medmenham abb.	Bucks	III D e.
Cl.	Mendham pr.	Suffolk	I F d.
C.	Merevale abb.	Warwick	II D d.
B(n).	Merkyate	Beds	IV E e.
A.	Merton pr.	Surrey	III E e.
A.	Michelham pr.	Sussex	III E f.
	Middlesborough (see Whitby)		
B.	Milton abb.	Dorset	I C f.
A.	Missenden abb.	Bucks	III E e.
	Modney (see Ramsey)		
B(n).	Molesby	York	IV D b.
	Molycourt (see Ely)		
Cl.	Monk Bretton pr.	York	I D c.
B.	Monmouth pr.	Monmouth	I C e.
Cl.	Montacute pr.	Somerset	I C e.
"	cells :—Carswell	Devon	" B f.
"	Cyrus, St.	Cornwall	" A f.
"	Holme	Dorset	" D f.
"	Malpas	Monmouth	" C e.

ORDER.	HOUSE.	COUNTY.	REFERENCE TO MAP.
	Morfield (see Shrewsbury)		
A.	Motisfont pr.	Hants	III D e.
A.	Mountjoy pr.	Norfolk	III F d.
B.	Muchelney abb.	Somerset	I C e.
C.	Neath abb.	Glamorgan	II B e.
B.	Neots, St., pr.	Hunts	I E d.
B(n).	Nessham	Northumberland	IV D h.
C.	Netley abb.	Hants	II D f.
P.	Neubo abb.	Lincoln	III E c.
A.	Newburgh pr.	York	III D b.
B(n).	Newcastle-on-Tyne	Northumberland	IV D a.
A.	Newenham pr.	Beds	III E d.
C.	Newenham abb.	Devon	II C f.
P.	Newhouse abb.	Lincoln	III E c.
C.	Newminster abb.	Northumberland	II D b.
A.	Newstead (by Stamford) pr.	Lincoln	III E d.
G.	Newstead (in Lindsey)	"	IV E c.
A.	Newstead (in Sherwood) pr.	Notts	III D c.
A.	Nocton pr.	Lincoln	III E c.
Cl.	Northampton, St. Andrew's pr.	Northants	I D d.
A.	Northampton, St. James's pr.	"	III D d.
A.	Norton pr	Cheshire	III C c.
B.	Norwich Cath. pr.	Norfolk	I F d.
"	cells:—Aldeby	"	" F d.
"	Hoxne	Suffolk	" F d.
"	Lynne	Norfolk	" E d.
"	Norwich, St. Leonard's	"	" F d.
"	Yarmouth	"	" F d.
A.	Nostell pr.	York	III D c.
"	cells:—Bamburgh	Northumberland	" Da.
"	Bredon	Leicester	" Dd.
"	Hyrst, in Axholme	Lincoln	" Dc.
"	Tockwith	York	" Db.
"	Widkirk	"	" Dc.
C(n).	Nunappleton	York	IV D b.
B(n).	Nunburnholme	"	IV E b.
C(n).	Nuncoton	Lincoln	IV E c.
B(n).	Nuneaton	Warwick	IV D d.
B(n).	Nunkeling	York	IV E b.
B(n).	Nunmonkton	"	IV D b.

ORDER.	HOUSE.	COUNTY.	REFERENCE TO MAP.
A.	Nutley abb.	Bucks	III De.
G.	Ormesby	Lincoln	IV E c.
A.	Oseney abb.	Oxford	III De.
A.	Osith, St., abb.	Essex	III F e.
A.	Osulveston abb.	Leicester	III D d.
G.	Ovingham (see Hexham)		
G.	Ovingham	York	IV D b.
A.	Oxford, St. Frideswide's pr.	Oxford	III De.
	Oxford, Canterbury College (see Canterbury Christ Church)		
	Oxford, Durham College (see Durham)		
B.	Oxford, Gloucester Hall	"	I De.
A.	Oxford, St. Mary's College	"	III De.
C.	Oxford, St. Bernard's College	"	II De.
	Oxney (see Peterborough)		
	Pembroke (see Albans, St.)		
B(?)	Penmon pr.	Anglesey	I B c.
A.	Penney pr.	Norfolk	III F d.
"	cell : - Wormgay	"	" E d.
"	Penwortham (see Evesham)		
B.	Pershore abb.	Worcester	I C d.
B.	Peterborough abb.	Northampton	I E d.
"	cell : - Oxney	"	" E d.
B.	Pille pr.	Pembroke	I A d.
	Pilton (see Malmesbury)		
C(n).	Pinley	Warwick	IV D d.
C.	Pipewell abb.	Northants	II D d.
A.	Plympton pr.	Devon	III B f.
"	cells : - St. Anthony in Rose- land	Cornwall	" A f.
"	St. Mary de Marsh	Devon	" B f.
B(n).	Pollesworth	Warwick	IV D d.
B(n).	Polslo	Devon	IV B f.
Cl.	Pontefract	York	I D c.
A.	Porchester pr.	Hants	III D f.
A.	Poughley pr.	Berks	III De.
B(n).	Praye, St. Mary de la (St. Albans)	Herts	IV E c.
B(n).	Pre, de (Derby)	Derby	IV D c.
Cl(n).	Pre, de la	Northants	IV D d.

ORDER.	HOUSE.	COUNTY.	REFERENCE TO MAP.
Cl.	Prittlewell, pr.	Essex	I F e.
G.	Pulton	Wilts	IV D e.
A.	Pynham pr.	Sussex	III E f
C.	Quarrer abb. (Isle of Wight)	Hants	II D f.
P.	Radegund's, St.	Kent	III F e.
B.	Ramsey abb.	Hunts	I E d.
"	cells :—Ives, St.	"	" E d.
"	Modney	Norfolk	" E d.
A.	Ravenston pr.	Bucks	III D d.
B.	Reading abb.	Berks	I D e.
"	cell :—Leominster	Hereford	" C d.
B(n).	Redburn (see Albans, St.)		
A.	Redlingfield	Suffolk	IV F d.
A.	Repton pr.	Derby	III D c.
C.	Revesby abb.	Lincoln	II E c.
C.	Rewley abb.	Oxford	II D e.
A.	Reygate pr.	Surrey	III E e.
	Richmond St. Martin's (see York, St. Mary's)		
C.	Rivaulx abb.	York	II D b.
C.	Robertsbridge abb.	Sussex	II F e.
A.	Rocester abb.	Staffs	III D c.
C.	Roche abb.	York	II D c.
B.	Rochester Cath. pr.	Kent	I E e.
	cell :—Felixstowe	Suffolk	" F d.
A.	Ronton pr.	Staffs	III C d.
B(n).	Rosedale	York	IV D b.
A(n).	Rothwell	Northants	IV D d.
A.	Royston pr.	Herts	III E d.
C.	Rufford abb.	Notts	II D c.
	Rumburgh (see York St. Mary)		
B(n).	Rumsey	Hants	IV D e.
B(n).	Rusper	Sussex	IV E e.
B.	Sandwell pr.	Staffs	I C d.
C.	Sawley abb.	York	II C b.
C.	Sawtre abb.	Hunts	II E d.
B.	Selby abb.	York	I D b.
"	cell :—Snaith	"	" D c.
G.	Sempringham	Lincoln	IV E c.

ORDER.	HOUSE.	COUNTY.	REFER- ENCE TO MAP.
B(n).	Seton	Cumberland	IV B b.
C(n).	Sewardesley	Northants	IV D d.
B(n).	Shaftesbury	Dorset	IV C e.
P.	Shap abb.	Westmoreland	III C b.
A.	Shelford pr.	Notts	III D c.
B(n).	Shepey (Minster in)	Kent	IV F e.
B.	Sherborne abb.	Dorset	I C e.
"	cells :—Horton	"	" D f.
"	Kidwelly	Carmarthen	" B e.
G.	Shouldham	Norfolk	IV E d.
B.	Shrewsbury abb.	Salop	I C d.
"	cell :—Morfield	"	" C d.
C.	Sibton abb.	Suffolk	II F d.
C(n).	Sinningthwaite	York	IV D b.
G.	Sixhills	Lincoln	IV E c.
	Snaith (see Selby)		
B(?)	Snape	Suffolk	I F d.
B.	Snetteshall pr.	Bucks	I D d.
B(n).	Sopwell	Herts	IV E e.
A.	Southampton St. Dennys pr.	Hants	III D e.
A.	Southwark St. Mary Overy pr.	Surrey	III E e.
	Southwick (see Porchester)		
B.	Spalding abbey	Lincoln	I E d.
A.	Stafford St. Thomas's pr.	Stafford	III D d.
	Stamford St. Leonard's (see Durham)		
B(n).	Stamford St. Michael's	Northants	IV E d.
	Stanesgate (see Lewes)		
B(n).	Stanfield	Lincoln	IV E c
	Stanlaw (see Whalley)		
C.	Stanleigh abb.	Wilts	II C e.
	Stanley St. Leonard's (see Gloucester St. Peter's)		
A.	Staverdale pr.	Somerset	III C e.
C(n).	Stixwold	Lincoln	IV E c.
A.	Stone pr.	Staffs	III C c.
C.	Stoneleigh abb.	Warwick	II D d.
A.	Stonely pr.	Hunts	III E d.
C.	Stratflour abb.	Cardigan	II B d.
B(n).	Stratford at Bow (Bromley)	Middlesex	IV E e.
C.	Stratford Langthorn (West Ham) abb.	Essex	II E e.

ORDER.	HOUSE.	COUNTY.	REFERENCE TO MAP.
C.	Strat Margel abb.	Montgomery	II C d.
B(n).	Studley	Oxford	IV D e.
A.	Studley pr.	Warwick	III D d.
	Sudbury (see Westminster)		
P.	Sulby abb.	Northants	III D d.
B(n).	Swaffham	Cambridge	IV E d.
C(n).	Swine	York	IV E b.
C.	Swineshed abb.	Lincoln	II E c.
Bridg.	Syon	Middlesex	IV E e.
P.	Tallagh abb.	Carmarthen	III B d.
A.	Tandridge pr.	Surrey	III E e.
C(n).	Tarrant	Dorset	IV C f.
A.	Taunton pr.	Somerset	III C e.
B.	Tavistock abb.	Devon	I B f.
"	cell:—Cowick	"	" B f.
B.	Tewkesbury abb.	Gloucester	I C d.
"	cells:—Bristol, St. James's	"	" C e.
"	Cranborne	Dorset	" D f.
"	Deerhurst	Gloucester	" C e.
C.	Thame abb.	Oxford	II D e.
Cl.	Thetford pr.	Norfolk	I F d.
A(Sep.)	Thetford pr.	Norfolk	III F d.
B(n).	Thetford	"	IV F d.
B(n).	Thickhed	York	IV D b.
A.	Thoby pr.	Essex	III E e.
B.	Thorney abb.	Cambridge	I E d.
"	cell:—Deping	Lincoln	" E d.
A.	Thornham pr.	Lincoln	III E c.
A.	Thornton abb.	Lincoln	III E c.
A.	Thremhall pr.	Essex	III E d.
A.	Thurgarton pr	Notts	III D c.
P.	Tichfield abb.	Hants	III D f.
	Tickford (see York, Holy Trinity)		
C.	Tiltey abb.	Essex	II E d.
	Tinmouth (see Albans, St.)		
C.	Tintern abb.	Monmouth	II C e.
A.	Tiptree pr.	Essex	III F e.
	Tockwith (see Nostell)		
A.	Torkesey pr.	Lincoln	III E c.
P.	Torre abb.	Devon	III B f.
A.	Tortington pr.	Sussex	III E f.

ORDER.	HOUSE.	COUNTY.	REFERENCE TO MAP.
B.	Totnes pr.	Devon	I B f.
A.	Trentham pr.	Staffs	III C c.
A.	Tunbridge pr.	Kent	III E c.
P.	Tupholm abb.	Lincoln	III E c.
B.	Tutbury pr.	Staffs	I D c.
A.	Twyneham, (Christ Church) pr.	Hants	III D f.
B.	Tywardreath pr.	Cornwall	I A f.
A.	Ulvescroft pr.	Leicester	III D d.
B(n).	Usk	Monmouth	IV C e.
C.	Vale Royal abb.	Cheshire	II C c.
C.	Valle Crucis abb.	Denbigh	II C c.
C.	Vaudey abb.	Lincoln	II E d.
A.	Waburn pr.	Norfolk	III F c.
B.	Walden abb.	Essex	I E d.
	Wallingford (see Albans, St.)		
B(n).	Wallingwells	Notts	IV D c.
A.	Walsingham pr.	Norfolk	III F c.
A.	Waltham abb.	Essex	III E e.
Cl.	Wangford pr.	Suffolk	I F d.
C.	Wardon abb.	Beds	II E d.
A.	Warter pr.	York	III E b.
A(Sep.)	Warwick pr.	Warwick	III D d.
Fr(n).	Waterbeach	Cambridge	IV E d.
G.	Watton	York	IV E b.
C.	Waverley abb.	Surrey	II E e.
	Wearmouth (see Durham)		
P.	Welbeck abb.	Notts	III D c.
A.	Wellow abb.	Lincoln	III E c.
P.	Wendling abb.	Norfolk	III F d.
Cl.	Wenlock pr.	Salop	I C d.
"	cell :—Dudley	Staffs	" C d.
A.	Westacre pr.	Norfolk	III F d.
"	cell :—Massingham	Norfolk	" F d.
P.	West Dereham abb.	Norfolk	III E d.
B.	Westminster abb.	Middlesex	I E e.
"	cells :—Hurley	Berks	" D e.
"	Sudbury	Suffolk	" F d.
B(n).	Westwood	Worcester	IV D d.
	Wetheral (see York, St. Mary's)		

ORDER.	HOUSE.	COUNTY.	REFERENCE TO MAP.
A.	Weybridge pr.	Norfolk	III F d.
C.	Whalley abb.	Lancaster	II C b.
"	cell :—Stanlaw	Cheshire	" C c.
B(n).	Wherwell	Hants	IV D e.
C(n).	Whiston	Worcester	IV C d.
B.	Whitby abb.	York	I E b.
"	cell :—Middlesborough	"	" D b.
C.	Whitland abb.	Carmarthen	II B e.
	Widkirk (see Nostell)		
A.	Wigmore abb.	Hereford	III C d.
B(n).	Wikes	Essex	IV F d.
B(n).	Wilberfoss	York	IV D b.
B(n).	Wilton	Wilts	IV D e.
B.	Winchcombe abb.	Gloucester	I D d.
B.	Winchester, St. Swithun's Cath. pr.	Hants	I D e.
B(n).	Winchester, St. Mary's abb.	Hants	IV D e.
C(n).	Wintney	Hants	IV D e.
C.	Woburn abb.	Beds	II Ed.
A.	Wolinchmere pr.	Sussex	III E e.
A.	Wombridge pr.	Salop	III C d.
A.	Woodbridge pr.	Suffolk	III F d.
A.	Woodspring pr.	Somerset	III C e.
B.	Worcester Cath. pr.	Worcester	I C d.
"	cell :—Little Malvern	"	" C d.
A.	Worksop pr.	Notts	III D c.
A.	Wormley pr.	Hereford	III C d.
	Wormgay (see Pentney)		
B(n).	Wroxall	Warwick	IV D d.
A.	Wroxton pr.	Oxford	III D d.
C(n).	Wykeham	York	IV E b.
B.	Wymondham abb.	Norfolk	I F d.
A.	Wymondley Parva pr.	Herts	III Ed.
	Yarmouth (see Norwich)		
B(n).	Yedingham	York	IV E b.
B.	York, St. Mary's abb.	York	I D b.
"	cells :—Bees, St.	Cumberland	" B b.
"	Lincoln, St. Mary Magdalen	Lincoln	" E c.
"	Richmond, St. Mar- tin's	York	" D b.

ORDER.	HOUSE.	COUNTY.	REFERENCE TO MAP.
B.	cells :—Rumburgh Wetheral	Suffolk	I F d.
"	York, Holy Trinity pr.	Cumberland	" C a.
B.	York, Holy Trinity pr.	York	I D b.
"	cell :—Tickford	Bucks	" E d.
G.	York, St. Andrew's	York	IV D b.

I N D E X.

- Abberbury, priory of, i, 57.
- Abbeys, *see* monasteries.
- Abbots, position of, xxv; documents concerning, ii, 357, *note*, 442; attitude of, i, 312; number of, i, 295, 297, *see* religious.
- Abell, Robert, imprisonment of, ii, 316, *note*, 366, *note*; death of, ii, 486, *note*.
- Abergavenny, bells of, ii, 430.
- Abingdon, surrender of abbey, ii, 293-295.
- Adrian IV, bull of, i, 54.
- St. Agatha's, suppression of monastery of, ii, 130, 162, 166.
- Agriculture, condition of, i, 6, 15, ii, 492, *note*, 503, 513.
- Albald, re-establishment of monastery of, ii, 20.
- St. Alban, convent of Pre annexed to, i, 98; report of, i, 328; granted to Wolsey, i, 22, 79; deputation from Cluny to, i, 59; fee extorted from, i, 452; removal of abbot of, ii, 306; treasure of, ii, 308; surrender of, ii, 308; church of, ii, 436; intended restoration of, ii, 484.
- Alcock, John, bishop of Ely, i, 62.
- Aldgate, Holy Trinity, destruction of church of, ii, 394; accounts of, ii, 507, *note*.
- Aldington, parish priest of, i, 112.
- Alexander VI, bulls of, i, 61, 62.
- "Alien Priors," history of, i, 40-55; number of, i, 42; suppression of, by kings John and Edward I, i, 42; condition of, under Edward III, i, 43, 46, 48; some made denizen, i, 48; condition of, under Henry IV, i, 49, 52; final suppression of, i, 55; appropriation of, by William of Wykeham, i, 48; union of, i, 58.

- Allegiance, oath of, i, 174.
- Allen, Dr., complaints of, i, 87, 90; exactions of, i, 88, 261, 89, *note*; subsequent fate of, i, 383.
- All Souls college, endowment of, i, 57.
- Almond, John, ii, 488.
- Ambresbury, suppression of, ii, 229; pensions granted at, ii, 230, *note*; prioress of, ii, 456.
- "Amicable Grant," i, 84; difficulty in raising, i, 94.
- Anchorite of Canterbury, i, 127.
- Ancre^s of Worcester, ii, 273; of Pollesworth, ii, 17.
- Andover, priory of, i, 57.
- Antwerp, sale of vestments at, ii, 420.
- Ap Rice, John, visitor, i, 88; authority of, i, 254; letters from, i, 257, 259, 455; reports from, i, 327, *note*, 343, 455; financial dealings of, with Crumwell, i, 456; history of, i, 454; purchases of, ii, 390, *note*.
- Architecture, monastic, xxviii; ii, 433.
- Arden, convent of, ii, 16.
- Aristocracy of the Revolution, i, 11.
- Arnold, abbot William, i, 415.
- Arthington, convent of, ii, 488.
- Arundel, Thomas, archbishop, i, 51.
- Arundel, Sir Thomas, ii, 430.
- St. Asaph's, see of, ii, 469, *note*.
- Ashridge, abbey of, ii, 538.
- Aske, Robert, leader of Pilgrimage of Grace, ii, 9-120; family of, ii, 102; his report on the northern rising drawn up at the King's request, ii, 91, 131, *note*; attempts to assassinate, ii, 113; dealings of, with re-established monks, ii, 125; interview with the king, ii, 131; letter from, petitioning for northern parliament, ii, 132; accusation of, ii, 135; death of, ii, 158; opinion of convents, ii, 222; see Pilgrimage of Grace.
- Aske, John, brother of above, ii, 157.
- Athelney, destruction of abbey of, ii, 426, 431; surrender of, ii, 298, 301-304.
- Atherstone, church of, ii, 436.
- Attainder, working of law of, ii, 326; meaning attached to by Henry VIII, ii, 168.
- Aubrey, John, report of a Wiltshire convent, ii, 224.

- Audley, chancellor, i, 339; attempt of, to save More, i, 141; letter from, concerning Legh, i, 446; tries the Lincolnshire rebels, ii, 83; his trial of northern insurgents, ii, 157; petition of, for Colchester abbey, ii, 379; connection of, with Athelney abbey, ii, 300; share of monastic spoils, ii, 389, 431; popular demands for punishment of, ii, 49, 94.
- Augmentation, establishment of court of, ii, 9; bribery in court of, i, 14, *note*, ii, 396; sum paid into by re-established houses, ii, 20; total receipts of, ii, 388, *note*, 438; summary of accounts 1536-47, ii, 534-5.
- Augustin, Dan, "quondam" abbot of Wardon, ii, 197.
- Austin friars, poverty of, ii, 255; number of houses of, ii, 239; *see* friars.
- Avery, Thomas, steward to Crumwell, i, 413.
- Axholme, prior of, i, 218.
- Aylesbury, poverty of friars at, ii, 256.
- Badgecroft, Agnes, death of, ii, 477, *note*.
- Bagnold, Cecily, pension of, ii, 206.
- Baldwin, Alice, abbess, ii, 213.
- Bale, testimony of, concerning monks, xiv; i, 327, 337; memorials of the Carmelite order, ii, 240; of monastic libraries, ii, 423.
- Balland, Nicholas, monk of Hinton, ii, 300.
- Banbury, visitation of priory near, i, 175.
- Bannerman (*alias* Bonnerman), Florence, prioress of Ambresbury, ii, 229, 456.
- Bardney, connection of, with the Lincolnshire rising, ii, 81, 82.
- Barking, plate of abbey of, ii, 235; grant of abbey of, ii, 389.
- Barlings, connection of, with the northern rising, ii, 74; dissolution of, ii, 171; church of, ii, 171; *see* Mackarel.
- Barlow, bishop William, ii, 287.
- Barnard, Thomas, ii, 460.
- Barnes, Master, i, 112.
- Barnes, or Woburn, Dan Ralph or Richard, ii, 192; death of, ii, 202.
- Barrett, Thomas, prior of Folkestone, i, 364.
- Bartlett (*alias* Bartelot), clerk, i, 258; letters from, to Crumwell, i, 359, 360.
- Bartley, friar, i, 403, *note*.

- Barton, abbot of Colchester, ii, 374.
 Barton, Elizabeth, *see* Kent, Maid of.
 Basle, council of, i, 56.
 Bassett, Thomas, priest, ii, 278.
 Bate, abbot Robert, ii, 461.
 Bateman, bishop of Norfolk, i, 3.
 Bath, bishops of, i, 23, 58; search of abbey of, i, 300; present sent to Crumwell from, i, 418; destruction of church at, ii, 426; sale of abbey of, ii, 431; church at, xxviii; grant made to prior of, ii, 459; baths of, ii, 525.
 Battle, visitation of abbey of, i, 270, monk of, ii, 470, *note*.
 Bayker, John, description of the state of the poor, ii, 511.
 Beaulieu, complaint of abbot of, i, 99; vestments from, ii, 418; surrender of, ii, 452, *note*; presentation made by abbot of, ii, 460, *note*.
 Beauvale, religious of, ii, 486, *note*; prior of, i, 218.
 Beckett, *see* St. Thomas.
 Beckwith, Leonard, ii, 395, *note*, 437, *note*.
 Bedingfield, Sir E., application from, for money, i, 245.
 Bedyll, Thomas, i, 183; sent to the Carthusians, i, 184, 208; reports of, from the Carthusians, i, 211, 237; authority of, i, 254; private purse of, ii, 396, *note*; death of, ii, 397.
 Beech, John (*alias* Marshall), *see* Marshall.
 Begham abbey, i, 86; sale of, i, 383, *note*.
 Belasis, Richard, ii, 174.
 Belchiam, Thomas, sufferings of, i, 191.
 Bell, Dr., bishop of Worcester, ii, 72.
 Bellarmine, cardinal, on the corruption of the clergy, i, 20.
 Bellow, Millicent and John, ii, 47, 60.
 Bellun, bishop of, i, 104.
 Belsington, surrender of, ii, 27.
 Benedict, St., work of, xxiv.
 Benedictines, power and wealth of, xxiv, xxvii; lives of, xviii, xxiii; steadfastness of, to the Holy See, ii, 333, 337, 354, *note*, 361, 362, *note*, 368; established at Bisham, ii, 33, 287; trial of three abbots of, i, 407, ii, 332, 349, *see also* Whiting, Cook, and Marshall; Crumwell's remembrances concerning, ii, 348; re-establishment of, at Westminster, ii, 483; general

- character of, ii, 498; condition of, in France, ii, 521; difference between the true Benedictine and the *Cluniac* and *Cistercian* organization, ii, 543-44; *see* religious.
- Bentley, abbot Richard, ii, 482.
- Bentworth, rectory of, ii, 453, *note*.
- Berall, Richard, monk of Reading, ii, 293.
- Bere, Dan Richard, imprisonment of, i, 237.
- Berkeley, lord, i, 179.
- Bermondsey, priory of, i, 46; name of prior of, 327, *note*; pension granted to abbot of, ii, 458; preferment of monk of, to see of St. Asaph, ii, 469, *note*.
- Berwick, suffragan bishop of, ii, 469, *note*; fortifications of, ii, 437, *note*.
- Bestney, Edward, i, 342.
- Beverley, share of Franciscans of, in the rising, ii, 137.
- Bible, reading of, in monasteries, xix, ii, 359; new translation of, ii, 198, 260, *note*.
- Billesley, provision for poor at, ii, 42.
- Billingsford, James, i, 174; examination of, i, 175.
- Bird, William, vicar of Bradford, attainder of, ii, 248.
- Bisham, foundation of, ii, 32, 33; Benedictines established at, ii, 287; resignation of, ii, 288-9, 289, *note*; sale at, ii, 418; endowment of, ii, 289, *note*.
- Bishops, relations with monks, xxv; general character of, i, 18, *note*, 19; love of wealth, i, 20, *note*; often foreigners, i, 21; non-residence of, i, 22; hostility of, to the nobles, i, 24; division of income of, i, 26; visitations of, i, 35-36, *note*, 38, 331; suffragans often Irish, i, 23; attitude of, towards Henry, i, 153, *note*, 249; suspension of authority of, over monasteries, i, 252, ii, 233; number of, i, 295; instructions from Crumwell to, i, 373; complaints concerning, by northern insurgents, ii, 50, 65, 93, 99; reception of the dissolved friars, ii, 274.
- Bishoprics, proposed, ii, 444, *note*; made, ii, 444.
- Bittlesden, accusation of abbot of, i, 176.
- "Black Book," i, 289; doubt as to its being laid before Parliament, and as to its ever having existed, i, 303, *note*, 306, 339; alleged destruction of, i, 304, 305, *note*; compilation of, i, 348.
- "Black Death," devastation of, i, 2-7; effect of, upon the church, i, 7.

- Blackwall, John, ii, 420.
- Blakeney, prior Robert, of Tynemouth, i, 417.
- Blakeney, monastery of, ii, 428.
- Blihtman, William, commissioner, ii, 186.
- Blonham, Dan Laurence, sexton of Woburn, ii, 192, 195; death of, ii, 200.
- Bocking, Dr., monk of Christchurch, Canterbury, i, 112, 126, 137; arrest of, i, 125; public penance of, i, 132; execution of, i, 150.
- Bodmin, friary at, i, 3.
- Boleyn, Anne, i, 91; hostility of, to the "Holy Maid," i, 123; marriage of, declared valid, i, 131, 152, 164; attitude of, towards Rome, i, 165, 251, 265, ii, 2, 383; death of, i, 285, ii, 1.
- Boleyn, Sir Thomas, ii, 330.
- Bolsand, Nicholas, ii, 486, *note*.
- Boniface VIII, bull of, i, 43.
- Books, service, destruction of, ii, 425, *note*.
- Booth, Dr., bishop of Hereford, i, 367.
- Boreman (*alias* Stevenage), Richard, abbot of St. Albans, ii, 306, 308.
- Borodale, Garwin, abbot of Holm Cultram, ii, 186; pension of, ii, 187.
- Borowby, Dane William, *see* Moreland.
- "Boston pardons," i, 382.
- Bothe, Dulcosa, prioress of Langley, ii, 207.
- Bourchier, Henry, earl of Essex, i, 163.
- Bourchier, Father Thomas, testimony of, to the Friars, i, 150, *note*, 190, 193.
- Bourne, abbey of, ii, 450, 451.
- Bowes, insurgent envoy, ii, 14.
- Boxgrave, lord de la Ware's petition for monastery of, ii, 29.
- Boxley, abbot of, i, 407; rood of, ii, 539.
- Bradley, Marmaduke, made abbot of Fountains, i, 337, ii, 150; bribe offered by, i, 443, 451, ii, 150.
- Bradley, Thomas, sub-prior of Barlings, the position of, ii, 81.
- Bradshaw, father Augustin, prior of St. Gregory's, Doway, ii, 480.
- Bradstock, prior of, i, 260, 444.
- Brampton, Robert, ii, 166.
- Brereton, Randall, capture of, ii, 86, *note*.
- Brereton, Sir William, commissioner, ii, 89.

- Brian, Sir Francis, connection of, with the abbot of Woburn, ii, 197.
- Bribery, prevalence of, i, 13, 91, ii, 21, *note*.
- Bridges, John, grantee of charter house, i, 243.
- Bridlington, dissolution of priory of, ii, 171; petition for shrine of St. John at, i, 272, ii, 171; removal of shrine of, ii, 402; share of priory in the northern rising, ii, 153; seizure of goods of, by the Duke of Norfolk, ii, 437, *note*; corrody at, ii, 531.
- Briggs, John, exiled abbot of Croyland, ii, 285.
- Brigittines, prior of, i, 213.
- Brinklow, on the lawyers of the Reformation, i, 13; on prisons, i, 15; testimony of, to the monks, i, 34.
- Bristol, friars of, ii, 262; Carmelites at, ii, 272; vestments of St. Augustin's at, ii, 419; bishopric of, ii, 444, 445, *note*, 469, *note*.
- Broke, William, monk of Charterhouse, i, 213.
- Bromehall, suppression of, i, 63.
- Bromholme, prior of, ii, 481.
- Brookby, Friar Anthony, sufferings of, i, 190.
- Browne, Dr. George, i, 157, *note*; appointed general of mendicant orders, and grand visitor, i, 173, *note*, ii, 243; proceedings of towards Richmond friars, i, 184.
- Brown, Anthony, friar, condemnation and death of, ii, 251-253.
- Bruern, abbot of, i, 277.
- Bruges, meeting at, i, 77; Carthusian house at, ii, 485-6.
- Bruton, abbot of, ii, 328; Legh's treatment of abbot of, i, 260, 445; Layton's report from, ii, 335; destruction of, ii, 426.
- Brynstan, friar John, sermon at Glastonbury, ii, 337.
- Buckenham, Robert, friar, condemnation of, ii, 263.
- Buckfastleigh, bells of, ii, 430.
- Buckland, destruction of, ii, 426.
- Buckley, Dom Sigebert, ii, 526.
- Buckmaster, Dr., i, 222.
- Bugden, Catherine's dwelling at, i, 166.
- Buildwas, Cistercians of, ii, 451.
- Bulkeley, Katherine, prioress of Godstow, i, 464, ii, 231.
- Burgoyne, Bartholomew, monk of Charterhouse, i, 213.
- Burnham, bells of, ii, 428.
- Burrall, Robert, pension of, ii, 372.

- Burton, abbot of, i, 295.
- Bury St. Edmunds, visitation of, i, 343; report of, i, 344, 457; lead of, ii, 427; pension of religious at, ii, 467; abbot of, ii, 482.
- Bush, Paul, first bishop of Bristol, ii, 445, *note*.
- Butterfield, Agnes, of Yeddingham, i, 354.
- Bygod, Sir Francis, rising headed by, ii, 134, 136, 153; death of, ii, 158.
- Bygyn, priory of, i, 342.
- Bykeley, Joyce, prioress of Catesby, ii, 212.
- Byrkhed, John, king's receiver, ii, 86.
- Byrkhed, Thomas, appointed abbot of Norton, ii, 87, *note*.
- Call, Dr., ii, 252.
- Calwich, cell (?) of Kenilworth, ii, 34.
- Cambridge, endowment of Christ's college at, i, 63; of St. John's college at, i, 64, 65, 77; University of, i, 253, ii, 445, 446, *note*; effect of dissolution upon, ii, 519.
- Campeggio, cardinal, i, 69.
- Cannington, payment made to nuns of, ii, 451.
- Canonleigh, abbess of, ii, 464.
- Canons Ashby, vestments of, ii, 418.
- Canons regular, injunctions for, i, 72; ii, 497, 499; number of, ii, 323; position of among religious orders, ii, 497.
- Canterbury, Christchurch, poverty of, i, 5; connection of monks of, with the "Holy Maid," i, 125, 146; character of monks of, i, 374; letter from prior Goldwell concerning habit, ii, 472-474; cathedral of, xxiv, xxviii; fire at, i, 271; St. Thomas' shrine at, i, 271, *see* St. Thomas; plate of, ii, 399; treasure of, ii, 405-410; Austin Friars at, i, 154, ii, 259; buildings of, ii, 434, *note*; St. Sepulchre's near, i, 113; election at, i, 293.
- Cantwell, Sir Thomas, i, 400.
- "Capacities," ii, 12, 56, 274.
- Capon, or Salcot, John, abbot of Hyde, i, 129, ii, 305; sermons of, i, 133.
- Carisbrooke, vicarage of, ii, 460, *note*.
- Carmarthen, petition for priory of, ii, 31.
- Carmelites, character of, ii, 240; number of houses of, ii, 239; pensions of, ii, 45; *see* friars.

- Carrow, convent school of, ii, 222.
- Carter, Thomas, abbot of Holm Cultram, ii, 183; share of, in the northern rising, ii, 184; fate of, ii, 185.
- Cartmell, disturbances at priory of, ii, 129-131.
- Carthusians, attitude of, towards the Observants, i, 184; towards Henry, ; cloister life of, i, 204; subscription of, to the oath of supremacy, i, 210, 236; holiness of, i, 203, 212; influence of Brigittine prior upon, i, 213; preparation of, for death, i, 217; reception of Crumwell's visitors, i, 222; imprisonment and execution of the three priors, i, 219-223; strict watch kept over, i, 229; instructions given to gaolers, i, 233; cruelties practised upon, i, 209, 227, 233, 239; removal of, to other houses, i, 236; surrender of, i, 241, ii, 287; adherence of, to old faith, i, 211, 401; visitation of, by Crumwell, i, 407; pensions of, i, 241, 242, *note*; buildings of, i, 243; re-establishment of, at Sheen, ii, 483, 485; subsequent fate of, ii, 486, *note*.
- Cary, dame Elinor, i, 91.
- Casali, cardinal, i, 101; letters from, i, 102, ii, 2; letter from Wolsey to, i, 106.
- Castello, Hadrian de, i, 71.
- Castleacre, surrender of, ii, 289.
- Catesby, report of monastery of, i, 357; bribe offered by, i, 416; letter from prioress of, ii, 209; suppression of, ii, 210-212.
- Cathedrals, erection of, i, 103, 107; removal of plate from, ii, 400. *See* Bishoprics.
- Catherine of Arragon, question of divorce, i, 95, 116, ii, 100; attempts to incriminate adherents of, i, 128; condemnation of the divorce by the Holy See, i, 153; attitude of the Observants towards, i, 157, 158, 164; poverty of, i, 245; death of, i, 285, ii, 1; history of the divorce, ii, 353, *note*.
- Catton, election at, i, 293.
- Catton, Thomas, abbot of St. Albans, removal of, ii, 306.
- Caversham, image of Our Lady at, i, 461.
- Cells, suppression of those belonging to foreign houses, i, 55, 58; resistance offered by foreign houses, i, 58, 60; later suppressions of, i, 99, ii, 34; profit derived by foreign houses from, i, 48; inquiry as to dissolution of, ii, 18; nature of, ii, 543-5.
- Cerne, abbot of, i, 417.

- Chambers, Dr., ii, 72 ; preferment of, ii, 445, 469.
- Chapman, friar Thomas, pension of, ii, 270, 454.
- Chapuys, Imperial ambassador, i, 110 ; letters from concerning the " Holy Maid," i, 128, 130, 144 ; relating to Parliament of 1534, i, 151 ; relating to the Observants, i, 189 ; to the separation from Rome, i, 214 ; opinion of Crumwell's visitations, i, 265.
- Charterhouse, tablet at, i, 4, *see* Carthusians.
- Chauncy, Maurice, testimony of, to the monks of Charterhouse, i, 203 ; pension of, i, 242 ; made prior of Sheen, ii, 485.
- Chelsea, palace of, ii, 448.
- Chertsey, reports of, i, 329, 336, 346 ; incorporated with Bisham, ii, 33 ; surrender deed of, ii, 287.
- Cheshire, popular disturbance in, ii, 85, 86.
- Chester, bishopric of, ii, 444.
- Chester, earl of, letter to, i, 409.
- Chester, St. Mary's, payment made by convent of, ii, 209.
- Chicheley, archbishop, i, 57.
- Chicksand, visitation of convent of, i, 345.
- Christ's College, Cambridge, endowment of, i, 63 ; poverty felt by, i, 5.
- Church, appointments made by the king, i, 19 ; effects of " Black Death " upon, i, 2, 6 ; condition of, previous to the reformation, i, 25 ; property of, in the reign of Edward I, i, 51, *note* ; reports concerning spoliation of, ii, 46, 48, 90 ; value of the miscellaneous plunder of, ii, 417, 417, *note* ; diminution of candidates for priesthood in, xxx, *note* ; rejected religious appointed to livings in, ii, 468-9 ; " capacity," desire for, ii, 470 ; candidates for sacred orders in, ii, 469.
- Church, dean, account of the monastic life, xvi.
- Cirencester, vestments from, ii, 419.
- Cîteaux, refusal to allow visitation of houses of order of, i, 309, *note*.
- Cistercians, general character of, ii, 498 ; suppression of houses, ii, 252, *note* ; difference between Cistercian and *Benedictine* organization, ii, 543-44.
- Clare, St., priory of, i, 57.
- Clarke, John, bishop, ii, 328.
- Clayton, James, ii, 477, *note*.

- Cleeve, abbey of, ii, 451.
- Clement V, bull of, i, 44.
- Clement VI, bull of, i, 3.
- Clement VII, bulls of, i, 65, 103, 107; coerced by Wolsey, i, 77, 81, 82, 97; petitioned by Grey Friars and Franciscan Observants, i, 86; imprisonment of, i, 95; poverty of, i, 97; Henry's attitude towards, i, 100; illness of, i, 105.
- Clement, mother Margaret, i, 237.
- Clementhorpe, suppression of convent of, ii, 15.
- Clergy, position of, previous to the Reformation, i, 18; appointment of inexperienced, i, 3; adherence to old forms of prayer, i, 402; attitude of, during suppression of religious houses, ii, 42-44; liability of, under the statute of *præmunire*, i, 391, ii, 330; share of, in the northern rising, ii, 63, *note*; relations between monks and secular clergy, xxv, xxix; "titles" supplied by monasteries to candidates for ordination, xxx, *note*; livings in patronage of monks, i, 34, ii, 522.
- Clerkenwell, last prioress of, ii, 475.
- Cleves, Anne of, ii, 347.
- Clinton, lord Edward, share of, in monastic spoils, ii, 389.
- Cloister, construction of, xx.
- Cluny, power of abbots of, i, 48; deputation from abbey of, i, 59; difference between Cluniac and *Benedictine* organization, ii, 543-44.
- Cobb, Thomas, master of "Holy Maid," i, 111.
- Cobbes, Richard, clerk, i, 282, ii, 359.
- Cockerell, prior of Gisborough, death of, ii, 158.
- Coke, lord, opinion on case of the "Maid of Kent," i, 148.
- Colchester, abbey of, ii, 373; reports of, ii, 375; oath of supremacy taken at, ii, 331, 376; connection of with northern rising, ii, 377; pillage of church at, ii, 385; bribe offered by, i, 416; dissolution of, ii, 341; lay possessors of, ii, 385; refusal to grant pension to monks of, ii, 457; abbot of, *see* Marshall.
- Colebrook, St. Peter's church, ii, 477.
- Colc, Thomas, ii, 467.
- Colet, Dean, sermon of, on heresy, i, 25.
- Collingwood, Robert, commissioner, ii, 36.
- Collyns, William, examination of, ii, 128.

- Combe, abbey of, ii, 461.
- Commissioners, royal, work of, i, 252, 284; mutual complaints of, i, 258, 263; number of, i, 290; returns of, i, 284, 356, ii, 16, 17; methods of, ii, 317; wealth amassed by, ii, 396; articles framed for, i, 255; charges made by, i, 261, *note*; appointment of in each county, ii, 12; *see* visitors.
- Commons, House of, i, 291; servility of, i, 321, *see* parliament.
- "*Comperta*," xv, i, 301; value of, i, 287, 333, 345; doubt as to being laid before parliament, i, 302, 338, *note*; commission of inquiry into, i, 305; documentary evidence for, i, 326, *note*; dishonest use made of, i, 338; not to be regarded as "confessions," i, 352; comparison of with "*comperta*" of episcopal visitations, i, 335, 355; comparison of, with reports of 1536, i, 356, ii, 16, 21; form of, i, 329, 340; date of, i, 335-338.
- "Confessions," doubt as to the existence of, i, 348, 351, ii, 69, 268, 292.
- Conished, priory of, i, 87.
- Constable, Sir Robert, connection of with Prilgrimage of Grace, ii, 109, 112, 134, 156; death of, ii, 158.
- Convents, suppression of, ii, 203; number of, ii, 204; refounding of, ii, 208; poverty of, ii, 213, 214; benefits derived from, ii, 221, 224; *see* monasteries.
- Cooke, Robert, friar of Rye, i, 164.
- Cooke, Thomas, monk, ii, 477.
- Cook, Thomas, canon of Twynham, ii, 487.
- Cook, Laurence, prior, ii, 366, *note*.
- Cook, Hugh (*alias* Faringdon), abbot of Reading, proceedings against, ii, 348, position of, xxvi; notice of, ii, 356-358; name and family of, ii, 357 *note*; petition of, for Henry's divorce, ii, 360; payment made by, ii, 72; zeal of, for Catholic faith, ii, 356, 360, 361, 368; attitude on supremacy question, ii, 361-2; his relations with the king, ii, 356; examination of, ii, 367; execution of, ii, 368-9, *note*; *see* Reading.
- Cope, Thomas, monk of Rochester, ii, 460.
- Cordrey, John, abbot of Chertsey, ii, 33, 287.
- Corpus Christi, shrine of, at York, ii, 399, *note*.
- Cornelius, friar Observant, i, 166.
- Cortt, father Thomas, sufferings of, i, 190.
- Court of Street, chapel of, i, 111.

- Coventry, ecclesiastical buildings of, xxix ; report from, i, 327 ; petition for church at, ii, 435 ; destruction at, i, 462, ii, 265 ; lead of, ii, 427 ; sale of plate at, i, 463, ii, 285 ; bells at, ii, 428 ; surrender of Benedictine house at, ii, 461 ; Carthusian priory at, i, 20, 49, ii, 462.
- Coventry Giles, friar of Reading, ii, 361, *note*, 366, *note*.
- Coventry, William, religious of Wombridge, ii, 16.
- Coverdale, Miles, informer, i, 401-403 ; on the poor, i, 16.
- Cox, Leonard, ii, 358.
- Crabhouse, report of nunnery of, i, 328, 347.
- Cranmer, letter of, relating to the "Holy Maid," i, 122 ; examination of "Holy Maid" by, i, 124 ; preaching licenses revoked by, i, 154, 315 ; unpopularity of, i, 154 ; sermon of, at St. Paul's cross, i, 137 ; opinion of the monks of Christchurch, i, 374 ; payment of, to Crumwell, i, 414 ; friendship of, with Crumwell, i, 426 ; Chapuy's opinion of, i, 315 ; assumed powers of, ii, 199 ; dealings of, with Dr. London, i, 467 ; question of consecration of, ii, 97, 100 ; declaration of Anne Boleyn's marriage, i, 164 ; connection of, with friar Forest, i, 198 ; answer of, to the Devonshire articles, ii, 492, *note* ; his attitude towards prior Goldwell, of Christchurch, Canterbury, ii, 472.
- Crediton, church of, ii, 436.
- Creyke, suppression of St. Mary de Pratis at, i, 63.
- Crossed Friars, story of prior of, i, 358.
- Crowman, Edmund, ii, 380.
- Croxton, mortality at abbey of, i, 4 ; election at, i, 179.
- Croxton, Dan John, monk of Woburn, ii, 195.
- Croyland, abbey of, i, 418 ; annals of, xxx ; plate of, ii, 284-5, 436.
- Crumwell, Thomas, agents of, xxxii ; complaints against, as Wolsey's visitor, i, 87, 90, 382 ; defence of Wolsey, i, 385 ; accessibility of to bribes, i, 89, 252, 337, 383, 413-421 ; message of, to Fisher, i, 116 ; his judgment on "Holy Maid," i, 124, 130 ; reign of terror under, i, 178, 395, 406, ii, 85 ; document of sent to the Charterhouse, i, 233 ; policy of, towards Anne Boleyn, i, 123, 285 ; power of, i, 279, 393, 403, 424 ; history of, i, 379 ; wealth of, i, 384, 413, 419, *note*, 431, *note*, ii, 394 ; unpopularity of, i, 387, 395, 426, ii, 51, 93, 115, 200 ; infidelity of, i, 380, 387, *note*, 423,

- 428; rise of, in Henry's favour, i, 391, 393, *note*; policy of, i, 382, 384, 386, 411, 420; sale by, of forged indulgences, i, 382; dealing of, with the religious, i, 256; persecutions under, i, 405-410; danger of, at Wolsey's fall, i, 388; expenditure of, i, 421-423; estates purchased by, i, 419, *note* 521, *note*; garden made by, i, 411; fall of, i, 424; accusations against, i, 427; confession of, i, 429; death of, i, 430; regulations of, for the clergy, ii, 45; letter from, concerning the Pilgrimage of Grace, ii, 123; limited powers granted by, to visitors, ii, 244, 257; popular demand for punishment of, ii, 49, 51, 65, 93, 105, *note*, 115; denies intention to suppress the monasteries, ii, 281; instructions of, to the commissioners, ii, 255, 320; "Remembrances" of concerning the Benedictine abbots, ii, 348.
- Crumwell, Sir Richard, possessions of, i, 419, *note*, ii, 71.
- Crundall, Henry, abbot of Roche, ii, 319, *note*.
- Cubley, Richard, canon of Wigmore, i, 370.
- Curwin, Dr., sermon of, i, 161, *note*.
- St. Cuthbert, shrine of at Durham, ii, 410-413; banner of, ii, 109-110.
- Dacre, lord, letter from, concerning parliamentary election, i, 299.
- Dalton, rectory of, ii, 458.
- Darcy, lord, opinion of, on supremacy, ii, 100; connection of with the northern rising, ii, 100, 134; accusation of, ii, 135; report of, from Jervaulx, ii, 173; execution of, ii, 158.
- Darcy, lord Thomas, grantee of Colchester, ii, 385.
- Darell, Henry, abbot, ii, 305, *note*.
- Dare, William, abbot of Langdon, i, 362; pension of, i, 363.
- Darrell, Joan, ii, 456.
- Darvel, Gadarn, image, i, 199, *note*.
- Davell, Robert, covenant of, with the Dominicans, ii, 254.
- Davy, John, imprisonment of, i, 237.
- Day, prior, grant made to, ii, 271.
- Delapray, dissolution of, ii, 213, *note*; pension of nuns of, ii, 462.
- Dely, Margaret, commemorative brass of, ii, 478, *note*.
- Denham, church of, ii, 478, *note*.
- Denny, abbey of, i, 257.
- Dennys, Mary, prioress of Kington, ii, 224, *note*.

- Derby, nunnery at, i, 177.
- Dering, John, execution of, i, 132, 150.
- Derley, abbey of, i, 176.
- Dermond, town of, ii, 476.
- Devonshire, demands of insurgents of, ii, 492, *note*.
- Dickinson, William, ii, 264.
- Dissolution, *see* suppressions, and surrender.
- Divine office, recitation of, xviii; labour of saying, xix, i, 74; regulations for saying, i, 74.
- Dominicans, character of, ii, 240; number of houses of, ii, 239; pensions of, ii, 454; re-established at Smithfield, ii, 483, *see* friars.
- Doncaster, meeting at, ii, 111, 114, 118, 120; Whitefriars at, ii, 283.
- Dover, report of monastery of, i, 362-364; sale at, ii, 432; suppression of monastery of, ii, 26; report of suffragan of, i, 375, *see* Ingworth.
- Doway, seminary of, ii, 475.
- Doway, St. Gregory's Monastery (now at Downside), its establishment, ii, 526; prior Bradshaw, ii, 480; and the family of Stourton, ii, 339, *note*.
- Down, bishop of, ii, 458.
- Draper, John, suffragan bishop, ii, 458.
- Drax, suppression of monastery of, ii, 91, *note*.
- Droitwich, friars of, ii, 260.
- Dugmer, Nicholas, ii, 486, *note*.
- Dunfield, abbot Edward, pension of, ii, 166.
- Duns Scotus, study of, abolished, i, 253, *note*.
- Dunstable, dissolutions at, ii, 256.
- Durford, visitation of abbey of, i, 268.
- Durham, life of monks at, xviii-xxiii; bribe offered by prior of, i, 416; monk of, ii, 469, *note*; cells of, ii, 482; cathedral of, xxiv.
- Dutton, Sir Piers, i, 415, ii, 86; letter from, to Crumwell, ii, 87.
- Dymmoke's banner, ii, 64.
- Dymmok, Sir Lyon, ii, 67; speech of, ii, 54; share of in northern rising, ii, 62.
- Dymock, Edward, ii, 75.
- Dymoke, Thomas, ii, 75.

- Edgcombe, Sir Piers, protest of, ii, 29.
 Education, of the poor, ii, 221, 497, 500; in convents, ii, 222, 224;
 decline of, ii, 518.
 Edward VI, spoliation of churches under, ii, 421; household
 expenses of, ii, 448.
 Egerton, Sir Peter, letter of, to Crumwell concerning the friars, ii,
 261, *note*.
 Elizabeth, princess, baptism of, i, 181.
 Elizabethan era, cause for greatness of, ii, 524.
 Ellerkar, insurgent envoy, ii, 102, 114, 134.
 Ellerton, prior of, nomination of, at Watton, ii, 143.
 St Elphege, Cripplegate, lead of, ii, 433, *note*.
 Elrington, Edward, ii, 420.
 Elstow, friar, reported by Lyst, i, 158; rebuke of Curwin, i, 162,
note; examination of, i, 163.
 Ely, grant made to monks of, ii, 460.
 Emaus, Thomas, of Worcester, i, 405.
 "Emparkment," complaints of, i, 16.
 Empton, rector of, ii, 477, *note*.
 Englefield, Sir Francis, ii, 486.
 Episcopal registers, i, 35-38.
 Erasmus, opinion of Warham, i, 120, *note*; account of the shrine
 of St. Thomas, ii, 405.
 Esher, Wolsey's house at, i, 387.
 Esholt, dissolution of convent of, ii, 16; notice of nun of, after the
 dissolution, ii, 478, *note*.
 Ethelred II, offering of, to St. Albans, ii, 309.
 Eton, endowment of, i, 57, 59.
 Eugenius IV, bull of (A.D. 1442, not 1452 as in *text*), i, 58.
 Evesham, cell of, ii, 18; appointment of abbot of, i, 456; sur-
 render of, ii, 309, *note*; lead of, ii, 433, *note*; reduction in
 pension of monks of, ii, 466, *note*; poor of, ii, 525; notice of
 monk of, after the dissolution, ii, 479.
 St Evroul, protest of monastery of, i, 60.
 Exeter, condition of diocese of, i, 37.
 Exeter, connection of marchioness of, with the "Holy Maid," i,
 129, 135.
 Exmew, testimony of, to John Houghton, i, 207; imprisonment
 of, i, 227; execution, i, 228.

- Eynon, John, priest, ii, 363, *note*; opinions of, ii, 361, *note*; death of, ii, 370-371, *note*.
- Faenza, letters of bishop of, i, 227, ii, 4.
- Faringdon, *see* Cook, Hugh.
- Farley, visitation of, i, 269.
- Feckenham, abbot, ii, 483; interview with Elizabeth, ii, 485; last days of, ii, 525.
- Ferriby, suppression of, ii, 91, *note*; return of canons to, ii, 108, 125, 126.
- Feversham, abbot of, ii, 470, *note*.
- Finch, William, cellarer, i, 91.
- "First-fruits," Henry's demands for, ii, 65, 70, 97.
- Fish, Simon, i, 32.
- Fisher, bishop, testimony of, to the monks, xxxii; suppression of religious houses by, i, 63; weight of example of, i, 77, 118, *note*, 246; opinion of the "Holy Maid," i, 115, 120, 140; statement of her revelations, i, 139; opinion of Savonarola, i, 115, *note*; opposition of, to Henry, i, 116, 246; refusal of, to accept Crumwell's terms, i, 118; contemporary evidence concerning, i, 143, *note*, 192, 198, ii, 377; attainted of misprision, i, 119, 141; fined, i, 146; death of, i, 244.
- Fisherries, decline of, ii, 517, *note*.
- Fitzherbert, Alice, abbess of Polesworth, ii, 222.
- Fleet Street, lead of friars' church in, ii, 433, *note*.
- Flempton, living of, ii, 468.
- Fletcher, friar, death of, ii, 486, *note*, 487, *note*.
- Folkestone, report of monastery of, i, 362, 364; suppression of, ii, 26.
- Fordham, Dan William, monk of Worcester, i, 279.
- Ford, grant made to abbot of, ii, 459.
- Forest, friar, confessor to queen Catherine, i, 157; reported by Lyst, i, 158; imprisonment of, i, 167, *note*, 192; life of, at the Grey Friars, i, 194; charges of duplicity against, i, 195; martyrdom of, i, 199; opinion on papal supremacy, i, 197-200.
- Fosse, pension of nuns of, ii, 463, *note*.
- Foster, John, report of Romsey abbey, ii, 311, 312, *note*.
- Fotheringhay, college of, i, 56.

- Fountains, resignation of abbot of, i, 336; election at, i, 415, 442; share of abbey of, in the northern rising, ii, 149; sale of abbey of, ii, 390; monastic lands of, ii, 510, *note*.
- Fox, Richard, bishop, i, 18, *note*, 24.
- Foxe, Edward, Wolsey's agent, i, 96; visitation of Wigmore, i, 369.
- Foxe, John, monk of Charterhouse, i, 213, 232.
- Francis, Dom John, ii, 376.
- Franciscan Observants, holiness of, i, 76; history of, i, 155, *note*, 189, *note*; house of, at Greenwich, i, 156, 186; defence of queen Catherine, i, 158, 164; appeal of to Rome, i, 86; attitude of, towards Henry, i, 155; attempt to appoint a commission for, i, 172; house of, at Richmond, i, 184; steadfastness of, i, 182, 188; suppression of, i, 188; sufferings of, i, 189, 191, *note*; departure of, to other countries, i, 190, ii, 243, 245; character of the whole order of, ii, 240; number of houses of, ii, 239, 240; pensions of, ii, 454; re-establishment of, under Mary, ii, 483, *note*, *see* friars and religious.
- Frankish, John, registrar of bishop of Lincoln, ii, 58.
- Fratres conversi*, ii, 498, *see* religious.
- Freeman, royal receiver, reports from, ii, 34, 43, 434.
- Friars, mortality of, during the Black Death, i, 3; remonstrance of, i, 86; complaints against, by Fish, i, 33; popular opinion of, i, 86; difficulty of controlling, i, 155, ii, 243; superior of, i, 171, *note*; "grand-visitors'" dealings with, i, 173, 181; steadfastness of, to ancient faith, i, 182, ii, 243, 246; proceedings of, at Richmond, i, 184; chief work of, ii, 238; number of, ii, 241, 322; departure of, to other countries, i, 190, ii, 241, *note*, 245, 246; poverty of, ii, 267, 271-273; sufferings of, ii, 242, 263, 274; London's reports of, ii, 265; pensions of, ii, 453-455; meaning of, ii, 497, *see* religious.
- Friaries, number of, ii, 239; not dissolved in earlier suppressions, ii, 242, *note*; decrease in supplies of, ii, 253; donations made to, ii, 254; sequestration of seals of, ii, 259, *note*; assistance granted to, by large abbeys, ii, 266; surrender deeds of, ii, 268; amount realized by suppression of, ii, 271, 273, *see* monasteries.
- Frideswides, St., Oxford, dissolution of, i, 81, 83.

- Froude, Mr., value of, as a historian, i, 166, 195, 290, 305, *note*, 360, 365.
- Frythe, imprisonment of, ii, 366, *note*.
- Fuller, Hugh, receipts of, for Yorkshire, ii, 90.
- Fulwell, John, i, 280.
- Furness, dissolution of abbey of, ii, 175-179; pension of monks of, ii, 179; destruction of, ii, 180.
- Fyllol, Jasper, gaoler at Charterhouse, i, 229; reports of, to Crumwell, i, 232.
- Gage, Sir John, wish of, to become a Carthusian, i, 204.
- Gardiner, bishop of Winchester, foreign ambassador, ii, 72, 123; Wolsey's agent, i, 96; visitation of Chertsey abbey, i, 346; danger incurred by, i, 460, *note*; helps to save the church in Southwark, ii, 436.
- Garendon, report from, i, 356; plate of, ii, 285.
- Garner, Brian, prior of Furness, ii, 176.
- George, friar John, letter from mother of, i, 183.
- Ghiberto, pope's official, i, 82.
- Ghislain, St., abbey of, ii, 475.
- Gibbs, John, pension of, ii, 454.
- Gigliis, Silvester de, Wolsey's letter to, i, 68; letters from, i, 71.
- Gilbert, Dr. W., ii, 328.
- Gill, Dom Harry, sub-prior of Watton, ii, 142.
- Gipsiano, Crumwell's instructions concerning, i, 409.
- Gisborough, election at, i, 415.
- Gisburne, prior of, ii, 305.
- Glastonbury, position of abbot of, xxvi, ii, 329; episcopal visitation of, i, 36, *note*; proceedings against, i, 407; oath of supremacy taken at, ii, 331; Layton's report of, i, 439, ii, 350; description of the monastery of, ii, 329; library of, ii, 329; hospitality shown at, ii, 330; visitation of, i, 36; ii, 334, 343; wealth of, ii, 329, 342, *note*, 344, 346, *note*, 350; dissolution of, ii, 341-342; refusal of pension to monks of, ii, 457; contemplated restoration of, ii, 483, 492, *note*. See Whiting.
- Gloucester Hall, Oxford, ii, 375.
- Gloucester, see of, ii, 444, 445, *note*, 472; bishop of, ii, 469, *note*; friars at, ii, 257; Lady Chapel at, xxviii; poor men of, ii, 511; dissolution of St. Peter's at, ii, 324; vestments of, ii, 419.

- Godbery, goldsmith, ii, 190.
- Godstow, London's treatment of abbess of, i, 464; suppression of, ii, 230-233.
- Gold, Henry, i, 133; execution of, i, 150.
- Goldcliff, priory of, i, 58.
- Goldstone, prior of Canterbury, ii, 323.
- Goldwell, Thomas, prior of Christ Church, Canterbury, i, 125, ii, 472.
- Gostwyk, John, letters from, i, 245, 280, 431; financial transactions of, with Crumwell, i, 420, *note*, ii, 308.
- Grace Dieu, report of convent of, i, 356, ii, 205; pension of nuns of, ii, 206.
- Graham, Dan Thomas, ii, 183; evidence of, ii, 184; grant made to, ii, 188.
- "Great insurrection," character of, ii, 62, *note*.
- Green, Dom John, imprisonment of, i, 237.
- Greenwich, observants at, *see* Franciscans.
- Greenwood, William, imprisonment of, i, 237.
- Gregory X, prohibition of, concerning the convent of Carrow, ii, 222.
- Gregory, Crumwell's son, i, 418; settled at Lewes, i, 421; enriched by Henry, i, 429, *note*; education of, i, 276.
- Grene, Thomas, abbot of Croxton, i, 179.
- Gresham, Sir Richard, purchases of, i, 280, ii, 390, 428.
- Grey, lord of Wilton, ii, 197.
- Grey, Thomas, monk of Rochester, ii, 460.
- Grigby, John, death of, ii, 250.
- Grimsby, Ingworth's report upon friars at, ii, 273.
- Grimstone, Elizabeth, ii, 479.
- Groyn, John, monk of Furness, ii, 176.
- Guernsey, friars of, ii, 245.
- Gwent, Richard, report of "Holy Maid," i, 124.
- Gybson, William, imprisonment of, ii, 250.
- Gyffard, George, royal commissioner, i, 357; letter from concerning Catesby, ii, 211.
- Gysborough, William and George, execution of, ii, 250.
- Habington, Mr., ii, 480.
- Hackney, palace of, ii, 448.

- Hadleigh, master, monk of Canterbury Cath., i, 112; arrest of, i, 125.
- Hadrian de Castello, cardinal, i, 71.
- Halforde, Philip, abbot of Evesham, i, 456, ii, 310.
- Hale, John, execution of, i, 223.
- Hales, Christopher, attorney general, i, 125.
- Hall, value of as a historian, i, 197, *note*.
- Hall, or Stofs, Leonard, ii, 486, *note*.
- Hall, Dr. Richard, life of Fisher, i, 246.
- Hall, Robert, abbot of Norton, ii, 87, *note*.
- Hall, Thomas, grantee of Charterhouse, i, 243.
- Hall, William, accuser of abbot Marshall, i, 399.
- Halom, John, testimony of, concerning Aske, ii, 134; examination of, ii, 140.
- Haltemprice, suppression of, ii, 125, 126.
- Hamell, priory of, i, 57.
- Hamlin, Robert, abbot of Athelney, ii, 304.
- Hammerton, Sir Stephen, ii, 154; death of, ii, 158; lands of, ii, 390.
- Hampton Court, palace of, ii, 448.
- Hampton, Dan William, ii, 196.
- Harding, Roland, ii, 254.
- Harpfield, Nicholas, account of Cranmer's sermon, i, 318.
- Harrison, Charles, will of, ii, 483, *note*.
- Hartlepool, Roger, ii, 147, *note*.
- Harwood, John, abbot of Vale Royal, ii, 296; charge against, ii, 297.
- Haye, Johan de la, i, 172.
- Hayfield, Thomas, arrest of, i, 182.
- Hayles, abbot of, i, 281, ii, 152; reduction in pension of monks of, ii, 466, *note*; subsequent fate of a monk of, ii, 488; relic of Holy Blood of, ii, 536.
- Hayley, Dr., ii, 233.
- Haymo de Hethe, bishop, i, 64.
- Heneage, John, royal commissioner, ii, 58, 66.
- Henley, commissioner, ii, 412, 414.
- Henley, description of church of, i, 401.
- Henry VIII, despotic power of, i, 6, 11, 251; complaints made to, concerning Wolsey, i, 87; condemnation of Wolsey's visitors, i, 90; of Wolsey's methods, i, 92, 94; dealings of, with the

- friars, i, 155; divorce of, i, 95, 116; marriage of, with Anne, declared valid, i, 130; severance with Rome, i, 131, 154, 172; excommunication of, i, 131, 139, 153, *note*, 165; assumes title of "Supreme Head" of the Church, i, 174, 214; ecclesiastical appointments of, ii, 44; popular feeling towards, i, 157, 214, 244, 249, ii, 84; bill of, for suppression, i, 300; manner of dealings with the commons, i, 312, 386; declaration of, to the Lincolnshire rebels, i, 348; dealings of, with Crumwell, i, 385; policy of, towards those condemned to death, i, 429, *note*; declaration of, with regard to suppression, i, 412, ii, 279, 281, 287; avarice of, i, 151, 250, ii, 5, 381, 387, 400, 407, *note*; perfidy of, ii, 62, 123, 125, 160, *note*; prospect of reconciliation with Rome, ii, 2, 9; answer of, to the Lincolnshire rebels, ii, 70; vindication of, ii, 72, 121; despatches of, concerning the northern rising, i, 408, ii, 120, 160; instructions from, concerning the religious in the north, i, 409, ii, 160; early character of, ii, 331; faith of, ii, 6, *note*, 332; reports of death of, ii, 363, 364; incident concerning death of, i, 161, *note*; will of, i, 323; gains of, from sale of church lands, ii, 389, 391; periodical attacks upon church property, ii, 440, *note*; proposed act of, for spending monastic spoils, ii, 443, 444, *note*; dealings of, with officials, ii, 447.
- Herbert, lord, opinion of Wolsey, i, 109.
- Herbert, Margaret, i, 191.
- Heresy, increase of in 1500, i, 25.
- Hethe, Nicholas, prior of Lenton, ii, 189; execution of, ii, 190, *note*.
- Hewes, Dr., i, 179.
- Hexham, resistance of canons of, ii, 35-40; retaken from the canons, ii, 162, 165; plate of, ii, 166.
- Hill, Richard, accusation of, i, 316.
- Hillyard, Dr., *see* Hyliard.
- Hilsey, John, made visitor, i, 172, 173, ii, 224; report of, from Exeter, i, 180; sermons of, i, 236, ii, 538; pension of, ii, 454.
- Hinton, surrender of priory of, ii, 298-301; destruction of, ii, 426. religious of, ii, 486, *note*.
- Hobbes, Richard, abbot of Woburn, ii, 192; exhortation of, ii, 193; imprisonment of, ii, 195; examination and execution of, ii, 196-200.

- Hogge, John, ii, 460.
- Holbeach, prior of Worcester, ii, 469, *note*.
- Holcroft, grantee of Vale Royal, ii, 296.
- Holford, letter from parson of, ii, 301.
- Holidays, attempted abolition of, ii, 104, 118.
- Holimans (*alias* Hyckmans), Tristram, ii, 486, *note*.
- Holm Cultram, suppression of abbey of, ii, 182-188; value of, at dissolution, ii, 187; special commission appointed at, ii, 186.
- Holmes, William, ii, 486, *note*.
- Holyman, Dan John, monk of Reading, ii, 358, 359, *note*.
- Hook, dean, opinion of the Lollards, i, 55; of Crumwell, i, 397.
- Horde, prior of Hinton, ii, 299, 301.
- Hornby, surrender of priory of, ii, 27.
- Horncastle, rising at, ii, 62, 64, *see* Lincoln.
- Hornchurch, priory of, i, 48.
- Horne, brother William, i, 240.
- Horsekey, William, position of, ii, 139.
- Hospitality of monks, i, 34, 323; cessation of, after suppression, i, 311, 395.
- Hospitallers, enrichment of, i, 44.
- Houghton, prior of Charterhouse, early life of, i, 205; committal to the Tower, i, 208; second imprisonment of, i, 219; execution of, i, 224; signing of the act of supremacy, i, 210, ii, 331; opinion of papal supremacy, i, 202, 219.
- Howard, William, letter from, to Crumwell, i, 399.
- Hulme, monk of, ii, 469, *note*.
- Humberstone, provision for poor at, ii, 42.
- Humfrey, William, ii, 454.
- Hungerford, lord, attainder of, ii, 249, *note*; letter from, ii, 300, *note*.
- Huntingdon, accounts of monastery of, ii, 507, *note*.
- Hussey, lord, accusation of, i, 316.
- Hyde, commissioners visit to, ii, 404; purchase of, ii, 301; abbot of, ii, 305, 469, *note*.
- Hyliard, Dr. Richard, opinion of, on parliament of 1536, i, 294; his lost history of his own times, i, 295, *note*; encouragement of, to religious, ii, 313, 314, *note*, 456.
- Immorality, charges of, i, 287, *seq.*; ii, 492, *note*.

- Indulgences, sale of, by Crumwell, i, 382.
- Ingoldsby Legends, ii, 495.
- Ingworth, Richard, suffragan of Dover, reports of, i, 436, ii, 241, 257, 274; assistance of, to Crumwell, i, 375, ii, 244; testimony of, to poverty of the friars, ii, 255; desire of, to spare some friaries, ii, 261.
- Innocent VIII, bull of, i, 61.
- Ipswich, suppression of St. Peter's at, i, 97, 282; Wolsey's College at, i, 97; prior of Holy Trinity at, ii, 481.
- Irford, convent of, ii, 60.
- Isleworth, commemorative brass at, ii, 478.
- James, Roger, monk of Glastonbury, ii, 355.
- James', St., palace of, ii, 448.
- Jay, prior of Hexham, ii, 40, *note*, 166.
- Jennings, Richard, prior of Maiden Bradley, i, 365.
- Jerusalem, hospital of St. John of, i, 45.
- "Jesus" College, endowment of, i, 62; bells of, ii, 447.
- Jervaulx, share of abbey in the northern rising, ii, 144-149; suppression of, ii, 173-175; refusal of pension to monks of, ii, 457; subsequent fate of monk of, ii, 488.
- Jewels, disappearance of, ii, 404, 412, 415; accounts of keeper of, ii, 448, 535.
- John's, St., College of, Cambridge, i, 64.
- Johnson, Dan Thomas, imprisonment of, i, 237.
- Johnson, Elizabeth, nun, ii, 16.
- Johnson, Sir Thomas, share of, in northern rising, ii, 138.
- Joly, Christopher, i, 442.
- Jordan, Agnes, abbess of Syon, ii, 236; pension of, ii, 459; commemorative brass to, ii, 478, *note*.
- Jordayn, Dame Isabell, i, 92, ii, 234.
- Kechin, John, receiver, ii, 170.
- Kendal, vicar of Louth, examination of, ii, 48; address of, ii, 56; death of, ii, 83.
- Kendal, proclamation of pardon in, ii, 129.
- Kent, unpopularity of "amicable grant" in county of, i, 84.
- Kent, "Holy Maid" of, i, 100; history of, i, 111; influence of, i, 113, *note*, 122; interview of, with the king, i, 123; condemnation of, by parliament, i, 124; examination of, by Star

- Chamber, i, 129; by Cranmer, i, 124; public penance of, i, 132; confession of, i, 134; bill of attainder against, i, 130, 137, 145; revelations of, i, 138; sanctity of, i, 143, *note*; reading of bill against, i, 147; injustice of proceedings towards, i, 149; execution of, i, 150; More's and Fisher's opinion of, i, 115, 120, 138, 140, 143, *note*; lord Coke's opinion of her case, i, 148.
- Keveran's, St., Cornwall, i, 99.
- Keynsham, destruction of church at, ii, 426.
- King, Robert, abbot of Osney, ii, 245, *note*.
- King's College, Cambridge, endowment of, i, 57, 101.
- Kington, Aubrey's report of convent of, ii, 224.
- Kirksted, connection of monastery of, with the Lincolnshire rising, ii, 81; execution of abbot of, ii, 82; church of, ii, 171; monastery of, ii, 457.
- Kitchen, bishop, ii, 469, *note*.
- Knight, bishop, i, 90, ii, 72.
- Knights Templar, suppression of, i, 44.
- Kyngsmill, Morpheta, will of, ii, 477, *note*.
- Kytson, Thomas, visitor.
- Lacock, payment made by convent of, ii, 209.
- Lambley, spoliation of convent of, ii, 167.
- Lane, Ralph, Crumwell's agent, i, 400.
- Lanercost, suppression of monastery of, ii, 162, 166.
- Lanfranc, regulations of, xvii.
- Langdale, Hugh, examination of, ii, 140.
- Langdon, surrender of monastery of, i, 363; suppression of, ii, 26; story of abbot of, i, 360.
- Langley, report of priory of, ii, 206; dissolution of, ii, 207.
- Langton, Robert, prior of Holm Cultram, ii, 187.
- Lateran, council of, in 1215, i, 54.
- Lather, Thomas, examination of, ii, 144, *note*.
- Latimer, bishop, hostility of, to friar Forest, i, 194; evidence of, with regard to the "*comperta*," i, 302; sermons of, i, 199, 320; wish of, to preserve some monasteries, i, 374; trial of Emaus, i, 405; opinions of, ii, 99, 309; condemnation of, by abbot Hobbes, ii, 198; lament over decay of learning, ii, 519; opening of the relic at Hayles, ii, 537.

- Launceston, imprisonment of friars at, ii, 261.
- Launde, abbey of, i, 419, *note*, 420, *note*; plate of, ii, 283; sale of, ii, 391.
- Laurence, friar John, spy, i, 169.
- Laurence, prior Robert, imprisonment of, i, 218; execution of, i, 223.
- Law, administration of, i, 13.
- Lawrence, Peter, warden of Grey Friars, Reading, ii, 366.
- Lawyers, of the reformation, i, 13.
- Layton, commissioner, i, 252; methods of, i, 255, 257, 441; visit of, to the north of England, i, 286; "*comperta*" of, i, 336; reports from, to Crumwell, i, 268, 349, 400, 412, 439, ii, 26, 335; bribes taken by, i, 414; character of, i, 437; ecclesiastical preferment of, i, 437, 444; financial transactions of, i, 442; servility of, to Crumwell, i, 440, 443; report of, from Glastonbury, i, 439, ii, 335; popular opinion of, i, 452.
- Lead, from church buildings, ii, 426-428.
- Lecturer, divinity, appointment of, i, 281.
- Lee, Dr. Edward, archbishop of York, register of, xxx; opinion of the clergy, i, 23; visit of to Houghton, i, 209; visitation of, i, 334; share of, in the northern rising, ii, 109, 124; dealings of, with the friars, ii, 276; articles drawn up by, ii, 117; injunctions of, for Synningthwaite, ii, 215.
- Lee, John, canon of Wigmore, i, 366.
- Lee, Rowland, bishop of Coventry, sent to Observants, i, 183, 185; to Carthusians, i, 184, 208; payments of, to Crumwell, i, 414; petition of, for Coventry churches, ii, 435.
- Legat, Robert, prior of Furness, ii, 175.
- Legbourne, monastery of, ii, 47, 60.
- Legge, Mr., imprisonment of, i, 209.
- Legh, commissioner, i, 253, ii, 307; Henry's opinion of, i, 286, 454; visitations of, i, 327, ii, 186, 411; "*comperta*" of, i, 336, 343; history and character of, i, 445, 448, 450; fees extorted by, i, 447, 451; methods of, i, 445, 449; made master of Sherburn hospital, i, 453; unpopularity of, i, 454, ii, 165; Lincolnshire insurgents' petition concerning, i, 452; report of, from Vale Royal, ii, 296.
- Leicester, election of member for, i, 292; report on abbey of, i, 346; bribe offered by religious of, i, 417.

- Lenton, dissolution of priory of, ii, 189-191, 277.
- Lewes, prior of, i, 46; visitation of priory of, i, 269; grant of, i, 42c, 421; surrender of, ii, 289; Farley, near Bath, cell of, i, 269; destruction of church at, ii, 29c-293, 393.
- Lewis, father, Observant, i, 112.
- Libraries, destruction of, ii, 423; search of, i, 399.
- Lilborne, Thomas, sub-prior of Louth park, ii, 56.
- Lillechurch or Heigham, suppression of, i, 63, 64.
- Limbroke, convent of, ii, 464, *note*.
- Lincoln, bishop of, i, 90, 402.
- Lincolnshire, rising in, ii, 41, 67; object of, ii, 49; story of, ii, 55-70; character of, ii, 62, *note*; collapse of, ii, 71; trial and death of insurgents, ii, 82; general sympathy with, ii, 84; Ingworth's report of, ii, 273; articles of, ii, 65, 68.
- Lincolnshire, religious houses and lands in, ii, 41, 43, 434, 509.
- Litchfield, Clement, abbot of Evesham, ii, 309.
- Litherland, Agnes, prioress of Grace Dieu, ii, 206.
- Little Marlow, priory of, i, 275.
- Littleton, William, monk of Evesham, ii, 479.
- Llandaff, see of, ii, 469, *note*.
- Llangenith, priory of, i, 57.
- Lollards, i, 50, 55; effect of, i, 31.
- London, commissioner, i, 254; history of, i, 458; methods of, i, 461, 468; devastations of, i, 462, ii, 265; made master of New college, i, 465; information from, about Wykeham, i, 466; dealings of, with Gardiner and Cranmer, i, 467; punishment and death of, i, 465, 469; testimony of, to the poverty of the friars, ii, 256; incident concerning nephew of, i, 459, 460, *note*; letter of, from Barnwell, ii, 279; suppression of friaries by, ii, 264; enforcing of the six articles by, i, 467, 468; report of, from Coventry and Combe, ii, 461.
- London, Roger, monk, i, 282, ii, 360, *note*; fate of, ii, 366, *note*.
- Longland, bishop, ii, 67.
- Louth, rising at, ii, 46, 66, 83; dissolution of monastery at, ii, 46; fate of religious from, ii, 451.
- Luffield, suppression of, i, 62.
- Lumley, lord, share of, in Pilgrimage of Grace, ii, 109, 119; death of, ii, 158.
- Lupton, Dr., ii, 72.

- Luxemburg, bishop of, i, 71.
- Lybert, friar Francis, letter from, i, 191.
- Lylleshull, spoils of, ii, 427.
- Lyst, Richard, lay brother of Greenwich, i, 158, 159, *note*.
- Lyte, master, ii, 338.
- Macaulay on the causes of the Reformation, i, 1; on revolution, i, 11; beginning in literature of calumnies on monks, ii, 492, *note*.
- Machiavelli, principles of, adopted by Crumwell, i, 382.
- Mackarel, Dr., abbot of Barlings, share of, in the insurrection, ii, 63, *note*, 74-81; declaration of, concerning church property, ii, 46, *note*; imprisonment of, ii, 71; death of, ii, 83, 171.
- Madde, Thomas, ii, 488.
- Magdalen College, endowment of, i, 61.
- Maiden Bradley, prior of, i, 272; story of, prior of, i, 365.
- Maitland, Dr., opinion of Crumwell, i, 423.
- Mallet, James, chaplain to queen Catherine, ii, 85.
- Mallyng, monastery of, i, 350, *note*.
- Maltby, Simon, priest of Farforthe, ii, 47.
- Malvern, cell of monastery of, ii, 18; purchase of church of, ii, 436.
- Malvern, abbot of St. Peter's, Gloucester, ii, 323.
- Man, Henry, Carthusian monk, letter from concerning the "Holy Maid," i, 114.
- Manning, Cardinal, on papal supremacy, ii, 333, *note*.
- Mapledurham, library at, ii, 486, *note*.
- Marham, nunnery of, ii, 30; prioress of, ii, 481.
- Marillac, account of Crumwell's fall, i, 425; opinion of abbot Whiting, ii, 347.
- Markby, priory of, ii, 42.
- Markham, Sir John, visitor at Beauvale, i, 230.
- Marshall, Richard, Dominican prior, ii, 246, *note*, 248.
- Marshall, Robert, ii, 486, *note*.
- Marshall, Thomas, abbot of St. John's, Colchester, name of, i, 398, *note*, ii, 373, *note*; appointment of, ii, 373, *note*, 375; possibly abbot of Chester, ii, 375, *note*; life of, ii, 375-477; veneration of, for Fisher and More, ii, 377; imprisonment of, ii, 380; examination of, ii, 380; documentary evidence against, ii,

- 380-383; death of, i, 398, *note*, ii, 384; pectoral cross of, ii, 384, *note*, *see* Colchester.
- Martin V, bull of, i, 57.
- Marton, priory of, ii, 27.
- Mary, princess, wrong done to, ii, 2, 97.
- Masters, Richard, priest of Aldington, i, 112, 133, 137; attainder of, i, 145; fining of, i, 146; execution of, i, 150.
- Mathersey, religious of, ii, 482.
- Mayne, Thomas, confession of, ii, 70.
- Meaux, abbey of, i, 4, ii, 498.
- Melford, abbot of Bury, i, 344, ii, 323.
- Melton, Nicholas, ii, 58, 60; imprisonment of, ii, 71.
- Mendicant orders, object of, ii, 238, *see* friars.
- Michael, St., suppression of convent of, at Stamford, ii, 15.
- Middlemore, Humphrey, imprisonment of, i, 208, 227; execution of, i, 228.
- Middleton of Jervaulx, ii, 145, 148.
- Mileham, Nicholas, execution of, ii, 251.
- Mill, J. S., opinion of the revolution of Henry's reign, ii, 517.
- Miravale, bribe offered by abbot of, i, 415, 452.
- Missenden, prioress Mary, ii, 32.
- Missenden, vicarage of, ii, 460.
- Moigne, Thomas, of Lincolnshire, ii, 82.
- Molesby, suppression of, ii, 91, *note*.
- Monasteries, traditions concerning, xiii; daily life in, xv, xxii, ii, 239; popular opinion concerning, xxxii; social influence of, xxvi, xxxi, i, 249; dearth of annals of, xxiii, xxx, *note*; position of, at the beginning of the sixteenth century, i, 6, 27, 35; effect of Black Death upon, i, 7; poverty of, i, 28, 272, ii, 98, 255-273; spoliation of, i, 29, 261, 272, 308, 309, *note*; change of farming under, i, 30; burdens imposed upon, i, 34, *note*, ii, 20; proposed reform of, i, 102; transfer of papal authority to the crown, i, 152; terror inspired by the visitors, i, 176; loyalty of, to Rome, i, 247, *see also* supremacy, papal; value of, i, 250, *note*, ii, 387; Crumwell's regulations for, i, 255; report of larger houses, i, 301, 307, 338; number of houses accused by the visitors, i, 340, *note*; general tone of, i, 373; results of suppression, i, 373; misery and disorder introduced into, i, 273, 283, ii, 432; bribes offered by, i, 414, 416; prepara-

- tion in, for visitors, ii, 30; distribution of lands and revenues of, i, 422, ii, 388-392; hospitality of, xxvii, i, 373, ii, 91, 94; numerous benefits derived from, i, 322, ii, 95, 379, 386; election of superiors in, ii, 305, *note*; total number suppressed, ii, 322; plate of, ii, 285, 397-400, 415, *note*; value of, ii, 416, 417, *note*; vestments of, ii, 417-421; sales at, ii, 422; destruction of books in, ii, 423, *note*; lead of, ii, 426-428; bells at, 428-430; buildings of, ii, 431-436, 434, *note*; spoils of, ii, 437, *note*; act of parliament concerning, ii, 441; expenditure of, on national purposes, ii, 447; re-establishment of, under Mary, ii, 483; lesser houses, union of, i, 101, 103, 107; bill for suppressing smaller houses, i, 301, 309; suppression of, ii, 12-16; number of, ii, 19, 23, *note*; value of, ii, 24; number affected by dissolution, ii, 28; refounding of, i, 378, ii, 19, *note*, 32; list of all those paying to remain undissolved, ii, 529; account of the Treasurer of the Court of Augmentation, ii, 534; Episcopal Visitation of, i, 36, 332.
- Monks, relations between them and secular clergy, xxv, xxix; "titles" supplied by them to candidates for ordination, xxx, *note*; livings in patronage of, i, 34, ii, 522, *see* religious, friars, and nuns.
- Montacute, Cluniac priory of, i, 46; cell of, ii, 18; destruction of, ii, 426.
- Moore, "the blind harper," ii, 361, *note*, 364, 366, *note*.
- Mordaunt, lord, confession of, to friar Forest, i, 194.
- More, Christopher, letter from, to Crumwell, i, 293.
- More, Joan, nun of Derby, i, 177.
- More, Sir Thomas, on the condition of the poor, i, 17, 31; answer of, to Simon Fish, i, 33; complaints of, to Wolsey, i, 87; signs impeachment of Wolsey, i, 107, 197, *note*; opinion of the "Holy Maid," i, 138, 143; attempt to include him in the bill of attainder, i, 142, *note*; opinion of the Carthusians, i, 204; opinion of, on papal supremacy, ii, 334, *note*; contemporary evidence concerning, i, 143, *note*, 192, 198, ii, 378; death of, i, 244.
- Moreland, Sir William, monk of Louth, ii, 450; deposition of, ii, 55-61, 66; share of, in the northern rising, ii, 66.
- Morris, Sir Charles, ii, 428.
- Mors, Roderick, "complaint of," i, 13.

- Mottisfont, suppression of, i, 62.
- Mountgrace, prior of, ii, 314, 413, 456; surrender of, ii, 316, *note*; subsequent fate of religious of, ii, 486, *note*.
- Moyle, Thomas, report of, from Reading, ii, 343, 372.
- Musard, John, monk of Worcester, i, 278.
- Music, condition of, previous to the Reformation, i, 74, ii, 424, *note*.
- Myleham, Nicholas, death of, ii, 250.
- Mylward, John, priest of Todington, ii, 196.
- Mynne, John, ii, 420.
- Neekham, Dan Roger, monk of Worcester, i, 279.
- Nesham, surrender deed of convent of, ii, 228.
- Netley, dissolution of, ii, 453, *note*.
- Neve, dan Robert, ii, 196.
- Nevell, Marmaduke, ii, 376.
- Nevill, lord, share of, in Pilgrimage of Grace, ii, 109.
- New College, endowment of, i, 48, 57.
- "New men," ii, 392.
- Newbury, Coverdale's report from, i, 402.
- Newcastle, surrender deed of convent of, ii, 228; poverty of friars of, ii, 271; letter from Dominican priory of, ii, 246; fate of friars of, ii, 455.
- Newdigate, Sebastian, i, 226; imprisonment of, i, 227; execution of, i, 228.
- Newminster, monastery of, ii, 162, 165; suppression of, ii, 166.
- Newnham, bells of, ii, 430.
- Newsted, provision for poor at, ii, 43.
- Nicke, bishop of Norwich, i, 355.
- Nobles, decline of power of, i, 6, 9; hostility of, to ecclesiastics, i, 24; want of principle of, i, 298, *note*; grantees of monastic spoils, ii, 389.
- Noramville, dom Hugh de, i, 58.
- Norfolk, disturbances in, ii, 249; religious of, ii, 481.
- Norfolk, duke of, Henry's instructions to, ii, 110, 115; agreement of with Aske, ii, 118; trial of insurgents by, ii, 155.
- North Allerton, priory of, ii, 454.
- Northampton, report from St. Andrew's at, i, 349, 351; confession of abbot of, i, 351, *note*; Carmelites at, ii, 256; London's report from, ii, 265; St. James, abbey of, i, 357; ii, 462.

- Northumberland, Henry, earl of, i, 91; share of, in the monastic spoils, ii, 389.
- Norton, Burnham, death of, ii, 250.
- Norton, suppression of abbey of, ii, 86.
- Norwich, visitation of monasteries of, by bishop and visitors, i, 355; reports from, i, 327; mortality at, i, 2; special commission at castle of, ii, 250; opinion of the bishop of, ii, 252; poverty of friars at, ii, 272; see of, ii, 469, *note*.
- Nuns, sufferings of, i, 175, 265, ii, 225; petition of, to remain in convents, i, 275; visitors' reports of, i, 353, ii, 204; fate of, at the suppression, ii, 203; number of, turned adrift, ii, 237, 322; influence of, ii, 221, 224; number of, signing the surrender, ii, 228; number desirous of remaining in monasteries, i, 353, ii, 205, 206; pensions paid to, ii, 449, 459; life of, after being ejected, ii, 476-479, 488, *see* religious.
- Nunappleton, injunction sent to convent of, ii, 219.
- Nunburnholme, suppression of, ii, 91, *note*.
- Nuneaton, surrender deed of convent of, ii, 228.
- Nunkeling, sale of, ii, 390.
- Nuthake, Thomas, deposition of, ii, 383.
- Observants, *see* Franciscans.
- "Official" created by Tudor policy, i, 12.
- Oldcastle, John, bill of, i, 52.
- Ortiz, Dr., letter of, concerning nuns, i, 265.
- Orvieto, condition of pope at, i, 96.
- Oseney, abbey of, ii, 445, *note*.
- Osyth's, St., surrender of, i, 398; ii, 304, 379, 383; grant of, i, 419, *note*; Audley's petition for, ii, 379.
- Oxford, university of, i, 83, 253, ii, 445, 446, *note*; London's report of friaries at, ii, 266, 270; Benedictine establishments at, ii, 375, *note*; effect of dissolution on university of, ii, 481, 519, 520; bishopric of, ii, 444, 445, *note*; Wolsey's colleges at, i, 76, 80, 90, 94, 104.
- Pace, secretary, i, 69; departure of to Rome, i, 78.
- Pageant of popes, i, 327, *note*.
- Palmer, abbot John, ii, 27.
- Palmes, John, ii, 453, *note*.

- Pantfield, priory of, i, 43.
 Parker, William, ii, 60, 88.
 Parks, enclosure of, ii, 448.
 Parkyns, John, offer of bribe by, i, 415.
 Parliament "unlearned," i, 51.
 " of 1529, i, 300; election of, i, 292, 299; voting of
 subsidy by, i, 299; session of 1534, i, 151, 167;
 session of 1536, i, 288.
 " of 1539, ii, 337, 442, *note*; act of, for legalizing all
 dissolutions, ii, 441.
 " customs of, ii, 100, *note*; nature of, under Henry VIII.,
 i, 251, 291, 299; obsequiousness of, i, 297; duties
 of, i, 322.
 Parmensis, friar Paul, i, 171, *note*.
 Parr, Sir William, ii, 432.
 Partridge, Sir Miles, ii, 447, *note*.
 Paschal II, bull of, i, 54.
 Pasleu, John, abbey of Whalley, ii, 152; trial of, ii, 168; death of,
 ii, 169, *see* Whalley.
 Paul III, attitude of, towards Henry, ii, 3.
 Paul's, St., Cross, i, 133.
 Payn, friar Hugh, imprisonment of, i, 166; preaching and arrest
 of, i, 182.
 Payne, Hugh, ii, 420.
 Pecoock, friar, sermon of, i, 169; arrest of, i, 171; letter from
 concerning the visitation, i, 177; condemnation of, ii, 250,
 251.
 Peers, spiritual, xxv; i, 295, 296, *see* bishop.
 Peerson, Walter, imprisonment of, i, 237.
 Pell, Roger, vicar of Dalton, ii, 175.
 Penriche, dan Hamlet, monk of Lenton, ii, 189.
 Penison, William, report of, from Reading, ii, 373, *note*.
 Pensions of religious, i, 276, *note*, 353, ii, 15, 16, 449; conditions
 for granting, ii, 226; method of paying, ii, 463, *note*; reduc-
 tions made in, ii, 464, *note*, 466.
 Pentney, petition for prior of, ii, 30, *note*; report of priory of, i, 355.
 Perchard, John, i, 170.
 Percy, lord, share of in the northern rising, ii, 145, 149, 152;
 execution of, ii, 158.

- Peterborough, abbot of, i, 90; first dean of, i, 351; bribe offered by, i, 416; see of, ii, 444, 469, 472, *note*.
- Peto, friar, i, 158; sermon of, before Henry, i, 160, 161, *note*; examination of, i, 163.
- Petre, Dr., i, 279, ii, 56, 196, 300, 307; at Lewes, ii, 289; at Abingdon, ii, 294; report of from Evesham, ii, 310.
- Petty, friar William, ii, 264.
- Philips, Hugh, ii, 487.
- Pickering, Dr., friar of Bridlington, ii, 153, 154; death of, ii, 158.
- "Pilgrim," Thomas', i, 371.
- Pilgrimage of Grace, suppression of, i, 408; demands of people, i, 452, ii, 91; causes for, ii, 101; story of, ii, 102-120; absence of violence in, ii, 107, 111, 113, 131; dispersion of troops, ii, 121; importance of, ii, 89, 121; extent of, ii, 90; object of, ii, 106; partaken in by the religious, ii, 137, disaffection of the royal troops, ii, 121, 123; proclamation to the insurgents, ii, 127; dispersal of insurgents, ii, 127, 131; punishment of insurgents, ii, 136, 155, 163.
- Pinchin, John, ii, 487.
- Pipewell, dissolution of, ii, 432; abbot of, i, 416.
- Placidus, Dan, monk of Winchcombe, i, 278.
- Plague, at Coventry, ii, 435.
- Plain chant, enjoined by Wolsey, i, 74.
- Plate, monastic, ultimate destiny of, ii, 449, 535. *see* monasteries.
- Plays, religious, i, 314.
- Plukenet, Sir John, ii, 410, *note*.
- Plympton, prior of, ii, 464.
- Pole, cardinal, education of, i, 29, *note*; early nomination of, to benefices, i, 22; opinion of, concerning Crumwell, i, 384; denunciation of Henry VIII, ii, 7; accusation against ii, 367; dispensation granted by, ii, 470, *note*.
- Pole, David, ii, 470, *note*.
- Pollard, commissioner, ii, 343; companion of Whiting, ii, 353, 355; report of, from Reading, ii, 372; from Winchester, ii, 403; connection of, with Layton, i, 439.
- Pollesloe, re-establishment of, ii, 20.
- Pollesworth, valuation of convent of, ii, 17; report of the commissioners upon, ii, 212, 222.
- Pomfret, meeting of insurgent leaders at, ii, 117.

- Pomfret, poverty of friars at, ii, 271.
- Poor, spoliation of, i, 311, 377, ii, 41, 91, *note*, 181, 392; spoliation of, by Tudors, ii, 494, 511; instruction of, by the religious, ii, 95, 221; relief of, by the monks, xxvii, i, 107; increase of, i, 16, ii, 514; statutes for, ii, 515, *note*; Bayker's statement concerning, ii, 511-514; sufferings and degradation of, ii, 503, 510, 515, *note*.
- Pope, Sir Thomas, treasurer of the Court of Augmentations, ii, 10, 167; purchases of, ii, 295; share of monastic spoils, 397, *note*.
- Portland, works of, ii, 437, *note*.
- Pratis, St. Mary's de, suppression of, i, 63.
- Praemunire, use made of statute of, by Henry, i, 391, ii, 330.
- Pre, dissolution of convent of, i, 98.
- Printing press, influence of, xxxi.
- Prisons, condition of, i, 14, 209, 406.
- Property, rights of, i, 324; interference with, i, 322, ii, 44.
- Protestants, attitude of, towards Crumwell, i, 395.
- Public opinion, power of, i, 313.
- Puddington, death of the vicar of, ii, 202.
- Pulpit, use made of, i, 153, 315, 317.
- Pulton, living of, ii, 460.
- Punte, John, imprisonment of, ii, 250.
- Purgatory, doctrine of, i, 374, ii, 6, *note*, 49, 118.
- Pursglove, Robert, prior of Gisburne, ii, 305, *note*.
- Pyle, Roger, abbot of Furness, ii, 175; trial of, ii, 176; preferment of, ii, 180.
- Quare, abbot of, ii, 460, *note*.
- Quatuor, S. cardinal, i, 98, 102.
- Ramridge, abbot of St. Albans, i, 79.
- Ramsey, sale of abbey of, ii, 391; books at, 425, *note*; grant made to abbot of, ii, 458, 459; subsequent fate of religious of, ii, 487.
- Ranke, von, opinion of, concerning the monasteries, i, 249.
- Rastall, Mr., sent to Charterhouse, i, 222.
- Rawlins, Joan, prioress, i, 64.
- Rawlins, monk of Charterhouse, i, 230.
- Raynes, Dr., chancellor to the bishop of Lincoln, ii, 47, 62; death of, ii, 63.

- Raynes, John, bookseller, ii, 397.
- Raynscroftys, brother, Observant, i, 159.
- Reading, position of abbot of, xxvi; lecturer at, i, 282, ii, 359; execution of abbot of, i, 407, *see* Cook; London's report from, ii, 265, 359; oath of supremacy probably taken at, ii, 331, 362; fall of abbey of, i, 415, ii, 341, 356-373; communication of, with Aske, ii, 362; treasure of, ii, 372, 373, *note*; destruction at, i, 461, 463; refusal of pension to monks of, ii, 457; fate of friary at, i, 461; ii, 274.
- Rede, Thomas, ii, 488.
- Rede, William of Oxford, ii, 152, 163.
- Reding, Thomas, imprisonment of, i, 237.
- Reformation, causes for, i, 1.
- "Regal of France," jewell, ii, 406, *note*; 408, *note*.
- "Reign of terror," i, 178, 395, ii, 85.
- Relics, disrespect shown to, ii, 401, *note*, 414; popular opinion concerning, ii, 413; Holy Blood at Hayles, ii, 536 *seq.*
- Religious, daily life of, xvii; connection of with secular clergy, xxv, xxx; intercourse of, with the world; xxvii, ii, 238; general condition of, i, 27, 38, 73, 281, 341, *note*, 373; work of the monks, ii, 238, 335, *note*, ii, 495; oath of supremacy tendered to, i, 247; opinion of, on supremacy, i, 247, *note*, ii, 140, 143, *note*, *see also* supremacy, papal; adherence of, to old forms of prayer, i, 373; difficulties of superiors, i, 277, 280; election of those favourable to the king, ii, 305; charges against, i, 303, *note*, 339, 347; difficulty of disproving, i, 325; absence of investigation into, i, 307, 330, 352; relative number accused, i, 352; reappointment of, to livings, etc., ii, 21, 445, *note*, 460, 469, 472; current calumnies concerning, i, 358; absence of supposed confessions of, i, 347, *note*, 349; permission to appeal to Crumwell, i, 256; poverty of, i, 255-273; reception of royal visitors, i, 331; work of spoliation anticipated by, i, 413, ii, 78, 90, 282-286; bribes offered by, i, 91, 283, 414, ii, 21, *note*; number desirous of leaving monasteries, i, 353, ii, 33; dismissal of, from monasteries, i, 255, 274, 310, ii, 34; those dispossessed in the suppression of the lesser houses, ii, 28, 34, 322; total number cast adrift, ii, 322, 323; treatment of disbanded monks by the larger monasteries, ii, 460, *note*; departure of, abroad, ii, 475; share of, in popular disturbances, ii, 74, 137; reinstalment of, by the people, ii,

- 107 ; trial of, by martial law, ii, 162, 163 ; conformity of, ii, 479 ; popular opinion concerning, i, 249, 376, xxxiii, i, 34, ii, 492 ; charity of, xxiv, i, 34, ii, 500, 505, *see also* poor ; present opinion concerning, i, 289 ; sufferings of, i, 176, ii, 16, 243, 255, 263, 468 ; pensions of, i, 276, *note*, 353, ii, 13, 449 ; variations in, ii, 458 ; number pensioned in the earlier dissolutions, ii, 451 ; in the later dissolutions, ii, 453 ; patents of, ii, 457, *note* ; method of paying, ii, 464 ; fraudulent dealings with, ii, 466 ; books of, ii, 423 ; doubt as to ultimate fate of, ii, 274, 468 ; rapid disappearance of, ii, 481, 482 ; flocking of, to Oxford, ii, 481 ; ridicule of, an introduction of later days, ii, 492, *note* ; few particulars of, after Mary's reign, ii, 487 ; monastic order, recuperative power of, ii, 521 ; correct application of term monk, ii, 497. *See* Friars, Nuns, Benedictines, Carthusians, and Franciscans.
- Revolution, effects of, i, 11.
- Reynolds, James, ii, 427.
- Reynolds, father Richard, imprisonment of, i, 219 ; execution of, i, 223.
- Rhadegund, St., suppression of convent of, i, 62.
- Rich, chancellor of Court of Augmentations, ii, 11, 394.
- Rich, Hugh, of Richmond, i, 132, 168 ; execution of, i, 150, 184
- Richard, St., destruction of shrine of, ii, 402, *note*.
- Richmond, Observants of, i, 184, *see* Franciscans.
- Richmond, Yorkshire, articles published at, ii, 105, *note*.
- Rivaulx, church of, ii, 172.
- Risby, father, i, 132, 168 ; opinion of the "Holy Maid," i, 126 ; execution of, i, 150, 184.
- Roche, suppression of abbey of, ii, 317, 319, *note*, 322.
- Rochester, monk of Charterhouse, i, 230, ii, 156, *note* ; reported to Crumwell, i, 232 ; execution of, i, 240.
- Rochester, grant made to monks of cathedral at, ii, 460.
- Roderyck Mors, "complaint" of, i, 13, *note*.
- Rogers, Mr. Thorold, opinion of the monks, ii, 496.
- Rogerson, Ralph, execution of, ii, 250.
- Rokeby, James, commissioner, ii, 36, 187.
- Romburgh priory, seizure of, i, 100.
- Rome, separation from, i, 151, 172, 214, 251, ii, 331 ; court of, ii, 333 ; hope for reconciliation with, ii, 200, 278, 331 ; erasure of name of "bishop of Rome," *see* supremacy.

- Romsey, dissolution of, ii, 310-313; convent church of, ii, 436, *note*.
- Roscombe prebendal stall, state of, i, 22.
- "Roses," effect of wars of, i, 7-9.
- Rowland, *or* Pentecost, Thomas, abbot of Abingdon, pension of, ii, 294.
- Rowse, Robert, ii, 380.
- Rowte, Thomas, ii, 408.
- Rudd, John, imprisonment of, i, 136.
- Rugg, monk, execution of, ii, 361, *note*, 366, *note*, 368, *note*, 371, *note*.
- Rumney, priory of, i, 57.
- Ruskin, on St. Benedict, xxiii.
- Russell, Sir John, ii, 67; grantee of Woburn, ii, 202; wish of, for Droitwich church, ii, 261; charge of, against Whiting, ii, 350; report from, concerning Whiting, ii, 354.
- Rutland, lady, letter from, relating to the "Holy Maid," i, 130.
- Ryche, Richard, report of, from Abingdon, ii, 295.
- Ryprose, Elizabeth, abbess of Romsey, ii, 310.
- Sackville, dame Isabell, ii, 475.
- Sadler, Sir Ralph, accusation of, ii, 395.
- Sagar, Stephen, abbot of Hales, ii, 306.
- Salcot, abbot of Hyde, promotion of, ii, 469, *note*.
- Salisbury, intercession of bishop of, for Norton abbey, ii, 86; Salcot made bishop of, ii, 469, *note*.
- Salisbury, examination of countess of, ii, 8; lands of, ii, 390, *note*.
- Salisbury, St. Edmund's at, ii, 446, *note*.
- Salisbury, John, prior of St. Faith's, ii, 469, *note*.
- Salley, *or* Sawley, return of monks to, ii, 107; recapture of, ii, 162, 165; trial of abbot of, ii, 168; death of abbot of, ii, 154; report from abbey of, ii, 169.
- Salt, Robert, imprisonment of, i, 237.
- Salviati, Jacobo, letter from, to Campeggio, i, 104.
- Sampson, Richard, ii, 445, *note*.
- Sander, testimony of, concerning friar Forest, i, 195; concerning abbot Whiting, ii, 351.
- Sandown, hospital of, i, 3.
- Sandys, lady Margery, i, 280.

- Saunders, Anthony, lecturer, i, 281.
 Savage, Isabel, prioress of Stamford, ii, 15.
 Savonarola, Fisher's opinion of, i, 115, *note*.
 Sawley, Henry, monk of Furness, ii, 175, 177.
 Scarborough, dissolution at, ii, 256.
 Scott, Sir Walter, ii, 495.
 Scrope, lord, ii, 149.
 Scrolty, Roger, prior, ii, 283.
 Scryven, Thomas, imprisonment of, i, 237.
 Scudamore, Sir John, ii, 430.
 Sea walls, built by the monks, ii, 97; preserved by the monks, ii, 183.
 Sedbar, Adam, examination of, ii, 145-149; execution of, ii, 158, 173.
 Selborne, suppression of Augustinian priory of, i, 61.
 Selby, sale of abbey of, ii, 395, *note*.
 Service books, destruction of, ii, 425.
 Seymour, Sir Thomas, connection of with Romsey, ii, 312, *note*.
 Seyn, John, clerk, i, 398; deposition of, ii, 383.
 Shaftesbury, abbess of, i, 417; dissolution of abbey of, ii, 228.
 Sharpe, friar Richard, ii, 471.
 Shaxton, bishop of Salisbury, i, 282, ii, 293, 359.
 Sheen, Carthusian house at, i, 60, 184; re-establishment of Carthusians at, ii, 483, 486, *note*; tale of deserted house at, ii, 486, *see* Carthusians.
 Shelley, dame Elizabeth, abbess of Winchester, ii, 476.
 Sherborne Abbey, lead of, ii, 433, *note*.
 Sherburn college, Legh made master of, i, 453.
 Shrewsbury, friars of, ii, 262, 263, funeral of earl of, ii, 514, *note*.
 Shrines, destruction of, ii, 402-413.
 Shuldharn, priory of, ii, 481.
 Silvester de Gigliis, ambassador, i, 68; letter from, i, 71.
 Sisson, Oswald, ii, 395.
 Slythurst, John, ii, 460.
 Small, John, abbot, ii, 451.
 Smarte, John, suffragan bishop of Hereford, abbot of Wigmore, i, 368.
 Smithfield, priory of St. Bartholomew's at, i, 91; Dominicans re-established at, ii, 483.

- Somerset, receipts from dissolved monasteries of, ii, 437, *note*.
 Sopham, Layton's report of prioress of, i, 450.
 Southampton, friary at, i, 169-171, ii, 484, *note*; visitation of, i, 77.
 Southwark, church of, ii, 436.
 Southwell, Robert, ii, 30; letter from, concerning supremacy, ii, 264; concerning pensions, ii, 462.
 Spalding, prior of, i, 90.
 Spelman, Sir Henry, i, 311.
 Spying, use of system of, i, 316, 396, 399, ii, 248.
 Spylman, friar of Canterbury, ii, 259.
 Staines, Brian, accusation of the clergy, ii, 63, *note*.
 Stamford, surrender deed of, ii, 269; poverty at, ii, 15; destruction at, i, 462.
 Standish, bishop of St. Asaph, ii, 370.
 Stanley, Legh's treatment of abbot of, i, 260, 444.
 Stanley, Sir John, afterwards monk of Westminster, ii, 96.
 Stapleton, William, ii, 112; deposition of, ii, 126, 137.
 Stationers of London, i, 402.
 "Statute of uses," ii, 51, 52, *note*-54, 69; protest against, ii, 69.
 Statute of "words that be treason," ii, 99.
 Staveley, Ninian, insurgent leader, ii, 144, 150; deposition of, ii, 145.
 Stephens, Thomas, ii, 453, *note*.
 Sterkbone, Laurence, ii, 467.
 Stikeford, provision for poor at, ii, 42.
 Stils, Henry, ii, 475.
 Stixwold, letter from convent of, ii, 22; spoliation of convent of, ii, 212; refounding of, ii, 32.
 Stokes, Robert de, prior of Pantfield, i, 43.
 Stokesley, letter of, to Houghton, i, 209; opinion of, concerning early suppressions, i, 312; form of profession used by, ii, 236; oath of, ii, 332; treason of, ii, 370.
 Stone, friar, death of, ii, 260, *note*.
 Stoneleigh, plate of, ii, 285.
 Stoner, Sir Walter, magistrate, i, 401.
 Storme, friar William, imprisonment of, ii, 263.
 Stourton, lord, friendship of, for Benedictines, ii, 339, *note*.
 Stratford, Edburga, ii, 477, *note*.
 Stratford, "supposed prioress" of, ii, 234.
 Stretham, Edmund, prior of Crossed Friars, i, 358, 360, *note*.

- Succession, oath of, i, 203, 220.
- Suffolk, duke of, i, 87, ii, 67; share of, in monastic spoils, ii, 389.
- Suffolk, monastic spoils in county of, ii, 481.
- "Supplication of Beggars," i, 32.
- "Supplication of Poor Souls," i, 32.
- Suppression, destination of property in earlier suppressions, i, 56, 57; precedents for, i, 61-66; by Wolsey, i, 80, 85, 97-101; attitude of superiors during, i, 90; causes for, i, 247, 250; suppression of smaller houses, i, 101, 310; bill for, i, 288, 300, *note*, 307, *note*; value of preamble of bill for, i, 307, *note*; unpopularity of, i, 86, 252, *note*, ii, 44; difficulty in passing bill for, i, 311, 319, 321; sermons on, i, 317; result of, i, 323, ii, 34, 253; protests against, i, 376, ii, 29, 34, 65, 94, 199, 363; reports concerning, i, 412, ii, 46, 279; real bearing of, ii, 101; secrecy of, ii, 279; denial of intention of, i, 412, *note*, ii, 279; legal aspect of, ii, 325, *note*, 339; spoils gained by, ii, 438, 487, 488; subsequent distribution of property, ii, 389; fate of those receiving monastic spoils, ii, 394, *note*; social result of, i, 35, 373; ii, 490, 523; economic aspect of, ii, 505-517; educational aspect of, ii, 518-521; degradation springing from, ii, 510, xxvi; examples of, ii, 291-322. *See* dissolution and surrender.
- Supremacy, royal, i, 151, 174; act of, i, 214; acknowledgment of, i, 248; ii, 331; passing of bill of, i, 296; unpopularity of, i, 214, ii, 4, 44, 48, 98, 263; signing of, i, 247, *note*, ii, 331, 349, *note*; refusal to accept, i, 150, 197, ii, 143, 246, 249, 259, 381; form of oath of, i, 247, *note*; meaning of oath of, ii, 332, *note*, 333, *note*; examination concerning, ii, 381.
- Supremacy, papal, i, 174, ii, 333, 361, 381, 492; adherence of priests and religious to, i, 150, 186, 196-201, 211, 220, 228, 250, 403, ii, 118, 196, 202, 300, 349, *note*, 367; current opinion concerning, i, 170, 187; abbot Marshall's argument for, ii, 246, 264, 315.
- Surrender, form of, ii, 268; desire that it should be voluntary, ii, 225, 286; method of conducting, ii, 226; absence of deeds of, ii, 227, 268; number of deeds of, ii, 286; date of, ii, 287; opposition to, ii, 313; typical instance of, ii, 317; Hallam's opinion of legality of, ii, 325, *note*. *See* dissolution and suppression.

- Sussex, earl of, trial of northern insurgents by, ii, 163; instruction of concerning the abbey of Whalley, ii, 169; report of, from Furness, ii, 176.
- Sussex, riot in, i, 86; Layton's report from, 268.
- Swine, sale of nunnery of, ii, 390; subsequent fate of nuns of, ii, 479.
- Swithun, St., priory of, ii, 461, *note*; destruction of shrine of, ii, 403; vestments of, ii, 418; payment extorted from prior of, i, 447.
- Synninghwaite, poverty of the convent of, ii, 214; instructions sent to, ii, 215.
- Syon, suppression of convent of, ii, 236; pensions to nuns of, 459; history of nuns of, ii, 476; re-establishment of nuns at, ii, 483.
- Takeley, priory of, i, 57.
- Tarent, surrendered deed of, ii, 228.
- Tavistock, corrody granted by abbot of, i, 29; abbot of, i, 295.
- Taxation, burden of, i, 318, 320, *note*, ii, 45; result of suppression upon, i, 377, ii, 441, 443, *note*.
- Taylor, Sir Christopher, ii, 531.
- Taylor, Br. Hugh, ii, 486, *note*.
- Tempest, Nicholas, ii, 153; death of, ii, 158.
- Tempest, Sir Thomas, ii, 157.
- Tewkesbury, enrichment of, i, 58; abbot of, i, 295; present sent from, i, 418; subsequent fate of monk of, ii, 469, *note*.
- Thelisford, monastery of, i, 463.
- Thetford, petition of alien priory at, to be naturalized, i, 48; poverty of friars at, ii, 272; report from, i, 345, *note*; suffragan bishop of, ii, 469, *note*.
- Thirlby, Thomas, bishop of Westminster, ii, 445, *note*.
- Thirsk, William, *quondam* abbot of Fountains, i, 337; examination of, ii, 150, *note*-152; execution of, ii, 158.
- Thomas, St., shrine of, ii, 405, 407-408, *note*; treason of, ii, 406, *note*; erasure of name of, i, 400, 401, *note*, ii, 406; veneration towards, i, 196, 401; staff of, ii, 399, 409, *note*; life of, i, 400, ii, 344.
- Thomas, William, author of the "Pilgrim," i, 370.
- Thomson, father Roger, ii, 486, *note*.
- Thorn, John, monk of Glastonbury, death of, ii, 355.
- Thornden, Dr., dean of Christchurch, ii, 475.

- Thorney, abbot of, ii, 458.
 Thurlby, Robert, ii, 486, *note*.
 Thwaites, Edward, i, 110, *note*, 133, 146.
 Thwaites, James, ii, 150.
 Tiltey, surrender of monastery of, ii, 27.
 Tirry, abbot Edward, pension of, ii, 166.
 Tithe, exemption from, i, 54 ; transfer of, to laymen, ii, 522, *note*.
 Torture of prisoners, i, 408 ; ii, 253.
 Townsend, Sir Roger, Crumwell's agent, i, 403, ii, 292.
 Trafford, William, abbot of Salley, ii, 152, 155, *note* ; death of, ii, 168. *See* Salley.
 Trafford, William, prior of Charterhouse, i, 231 ; pleaded for, by Bedyll, i, 238 ; pension of, i, 241 ; attendance of in Parliament of 1536, i, 294.
 Tregonwell, John, ii, 212 ; visit of, to convent of Ambresbury, ii, 229.
 Tunbridge, discontent at, i, 85 ; Austin monastery at, i, 85.
 Tunstall, Cuthbert, bishop of Durham, i, 151, *note* ; excused from attending parliament, i, 294 ; servant of, ii, 413.
 Turnor, Ralph, pension of, ii, 454.
 Tutbury, priory of, i, 49.
 Twynham, destruction at priory of, i, 462 ; prior of, ii, 459 ; subsequent fate of canon of, ii, 488.
 Twysden, Thomas Bede, monk of Battle, ii, 470, *note*.
 Tyas, Elizabeth, ii, 479.
- Udall, Nicholas, ii, 492, *note*.
 Ulvescroft, pension of canons of, ii, 462.
 "Unitate Ecclesiastica, De," Pole's work, ii, 7.
- Vale Royal, election at, i, 414 ; dissolution of abbey of, ii, 295-298.
 Valor ecclesiasticus, i, 33 ; comparison of with commissioners' reports, ii, 17, 21, *note*.
 Vaudrey, provision for poor at, ii, 43.
 Venetian ambassador, reports of, i, 6, ii, 398, 421.
 Verney, Cecilia, pension of, ii, 451.
 Vernon, Margaret, prioress, i, 275, 276.
 Vestments, ii, 417-422 ; sale of, ii, 420.
 Visitation, episcopal, xviii, i, 36 ; account of, i, 331-334 ; of Austin canons by Wolsey, i, 72.

- Visitors, Wolsey's, complaints of, i, 87, 90, 99; fate of, i, 93, *note*; masterful treatment of the religious, i, 269; cost of, ii, 393; "grand visitors," i, 173, ii, 244-245; evidence of Crumwell's, i, 39; dealings of, with the Observants, 184; rapidity of work of, i, 267, *note*, 287, 329, *note*, 346; reports of, to Crumwell, i, 306, 327; value of testimony of, xiv, i, 287, 356, 376, 378, 436, 470; wish of, to calumniate the religious, i, 287, 329, *note*, 330, 345, *note*, 362; nature of the charges of, i, 335; absence of inquiry into, i, 287, 341, 346; letters of, to Crumwell, i, 358; character of, xxxii, i, 329, 433, 469; popular opinion of, i, 452; reports of, on the nuns, ii, 204; limited powers granted to, ii, 244, *note*, 257, 278, instructions given to, 226, 278, 455. *See* commissioners.
- Vowell, Richard, death of, ii, 250.
- Wadham, Jane and Catherine, nuns of Romsey, ii, 311.
- Wakeman, John, bishop, ii, 445, *note*, 469, *note*.
- Waldegrave, William, informer, i, 400.
- Walden, "*comperta*" of, i, 328; reports from, i, 328, 458; of abbot, i, 457.
- Waldgrave, prior of Tutbury, i, 49.
- Wales, marches of, i, 409.
- Walker, George, ii, 451.
- Walle, Thomas, i, 126.
- Wallingwells, religious of, ii, 483.
- Wallop, Sir John, ambassador, ii, 72, 123.
- Walsingham, sale at, ii, 432; shrine of Our Lady at, i, 403, 404; disturbances at, ii, 249; dissolutions at, ii, 256; priory of, ii, 481.
- Walstroppe, report of monastery of, i, 357.
- Walwercke, James, execution of, i, 240, ii, 156, *note*.
- Ward, Isabel, prioress, ii, 15.
- Wardeboys, John Lawrence de, ii, 458.
- Wardon, *quondam* of, ii, 197.
- "Wardships," ii, 52.
- Ware, dissolutions at, ii, 256.
- Warham, archbishop, letter from, concerning Wolsey's policy, i, 85; connection of, with "Holy Maid," i, 112, 118, *note*; Erasmus' opinion of, i, 120, *note*; treason of, ii, 369.

- Warner, Christopher, anchorite, i, 127.
- Warter, suppression of, ii, 91, *note*.
- Warwick, destruction at, i, 462.
- Warwickshire, royal commissioners' report from, ii, 17; cells of, ii, 18.
- Watton, Gilbertine priory of, examination of religious in, ii, 142; election of prior for, ii, 143; connection of with the northern rising, ii, 112, 139-144.
- Waverley, visitation of abbey of, i, 268; letter from abbot of, ii, 33.
- Wayte, Jane, will of, ii, 477.
- Webster, Augustine, prior, imprisonment of, i, 219; execution of, i, 223.
- Weedon Pinkney, priory of, i, 57.
- Welbeck, abbot of, made visitor, i, 180, religious of, ii, 482.
- Wells, palace at, i, 24; deanery of, i, 394.
- Wells (Norfolk), priory of, i, 43.
- Wendling, prior of, ii, 481.
- Westacre, report of, i, 328, 349; surrender of, ii, 291-293, 281; prior of, ii, 481.
- Westderham, canon of, ii, 481.
- Westerham, church of, i, 5.
- Westminster abbey, plate of, ii, 399; spoils of, ii, 419, *note*; effects of black death at, i, 4; bishopric of, ii, 444, 445, *note*; palace of, ii, 448; re-establishment of Benedictines at, ii, 483; closing scene at, 484; last abbot of, ii, 525.
- Weymouth, works at, ii, 437, *note*.
- Whalley, share of abbey in the northern rising, ii, 112, 152; suppression of, ii, 169, 170; refusal of pension to monks of, ii, 457. *See* Pasleu.
- Whalley, John, commissioner, i, 221.
- Wharton, Sir Thomas, commissioner, ii, 185.
- Wharton, Robert, pension of, ii, 458.
- Wherwell, nuns of, ii, 477, *note*; last abbess of, ii, 477, *note*.
- Whitby, John, abbot of, i, 277; election at, i, 415; church of, ii, 172.
- Whitehead, dame Isabel, ii, 488.
- Whiting, Richard, abbot of Glastonbury, position of, xxvi; family of, ii, 327, *note*; career of, ii, 327; election of, ii, 328, *note*; letters from, ii, 336, 352; character of, ii, 328, 329, *note*, 341,

- 355; examination of, ii, 343-346, 352; accusations against, ii, 345, 347, 350; injustice of condemnation of, i, 407, ii, 348; death of, ii, 352-356, 355, *note*; payment made by, ii, 72, *note*.
- Wickliffe, influence of, i, 31, 50.
- Wigmore, accusation of abbot of, i, 365; Foxe's report on, i, 369; lead of, ii, 427.
- Williams, prior, death of, ii, 487.
- Williams, Richard, purchase of, ii, 391; letter from, ii, 397.
- Willoughby, Cecily, abbess of Wilton, ii, 234.
- Willoughby, Christopher, ii, 234.
- Wilson, John, prior of Mountgrace, ii, 314.
- Wilson, Nicholas, ii, 315, 316, *note*.
- Wilton, appointment of abbess to, i, 91, letter of, to Crumwell, ii, 233.
- Wimborne, minster of, i, 22.
- Winchcombe, Dan Peter, monk of, i, 277; curate at, i, 278; lecturer appointed at, i, 281; grant made to abbot of, ii, 459.
- Winchcombe, Mr., i, 402.
- Winchelsea, Dan William, imprisonment of, i, 154.
- Winchester, effect of black death at, i, 3; endowment of school of, i, 57; cathedral at, xxiv; visit of Henry to, i, 246; jewelled cross at, i, 308; treasure at, ii, 403, 404; payment of prior of, i, 414; convent of St. Mary's at, ii, 21; last prioress of, ii, 475-478; buildings of, ii, 433.
- Windsor, college at, i, 62, 101; chantry and hospital at, i, 62.
- Wisbeach, causeway at, ii, 525.
- Witham, destruction at, ii, 426; religious at, ii, 486, *note*.
- Woburn, address of abbot of, i, 283; execution of abbot of, ii, 201, 191-202, 277; possessions of, ii, 202; refusal of pension to monks of, ii, 457.
- Wolman, Dr., dean of Wells, ii, 72.
- Wolsey, holding of pluralities by, i, 22; rise of, i, 67; dealings of, with Rome, i, 68, 77, 79, 82; suppressions of, i, 80, 85, 97, 101, 104; method of, in suppressing monasteries, i, 85; power of, i, 71, 79, 94, 97, 381; hostility shown to, i, 75, 84; made abbot of St. Albans, i, 80; servants of, i, 87, 90, 93, 99; faculties of visitation, i, 71, 83; endowment of colleges by, i, 76, 85, 98, 382; self-defence of, i, 87, 93; charges against, i, 94; treaty of, with the king of France, i, 95; attempt of,

- to be elected pope, i, 79, 105; proposal of, to be made vicar general, i, 96; court of, i, 381; life of, at Esher, i, 388; impeachment of, i, 107, 386, 391; distribution of possessions of, i, 392; death of, ii, 352, *note*.
- Wombridge, priory of, ii, 16.
- Wood, William, share of, in the northern rising, ii, 153; execution of, ii, 158.
- Woodlock, Richard, monk, ii, 477.
- Wool, increased demand for, i, 15, 17.
- Worcester, foreign bishop of, i, 21, 71; priory of, 278; imprisonment of prior of, i, 279; promotion of prior of, ii, 469, *note*; friaries of, ii, 274, 434, *note*; convent school at, ii, 221; sale of the convents at, ii, 431; shrine of Our Lady at, i, 405.
- Worksop, pension of a religious at, ii, 467.
- Wormesley, dissolution of priory of, ii, 283.
- Wriothesley, friend of the Observants, i, 190; letter from to Cromwell, ii, 71.
- Writtle, priory of, i, 48.
- Wykeham, William of, foundations of, i, 48, 59; London's report as to, i, 466.
- Wymondham, church of, ii, 436, *note*.
- Yarmouth, grant of, i, 419, *note*; poverty of friars at, ii, 272.
- Yngworth, *see* Ingworth.
- York, St. Mary's, episcopal visitation of, i, 36, *note*; royal visitation of, i, 287, 330; Layton's report from, i, 441; lead of, ii, 433, *note*; reduction in pension of monks of, ii, 466, *note*; religious of St. Leonards at, ii, 482; religious of St. Andrew's at, ii, 482; petition from Holy Trinity at, to be naturalized, i, 48; reports from, i, 327; meeting of insurgent leaders at, ii, 114; commission at, ii, 155, 157; grand jury at, ii, 156; Corpus Christi, shrine at, ii, 399, *note*.
- Yorkshire, dissolution of lesser houses in, ii, 24, 204.
- Young, care of, in the monasteries, ii, 96, *note*.
- Young, friar Thomas, ii, 471.
- Younger, William, death of, ii, 250.
- Zouche, Elizabeth, abbess of Shaftesbury, i, 417, ii, 228.

Printed by :
SOUTH COUNTRIES PRESS LIMITED.





E

F

Houses
of the
Cistercians
(White Monks)

a

a

b

b

c

c





E

F

a

a



b

b

kham + Bridlington
+ Warter
Haltam Price

E

F









